THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Dean of Winchester, The Deanery, Winchester, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XXIV FEBRUARY, 1932 No. 140

EDITORIAL

The note from Dr. Lowther Clarke which we publish below in "Miscellanea" gives a reasoned and independent defence of the much-criticized Form of Service authorized for use on the first Sunday of this year. With much of what Dr. Lowther Clarke says we agree, and some of the criticisms made of the Form undoubtedly derived a good deal of their force from the fact that passages selected for criticism were divorced from their context. But we do not think that the replies to criticism quite reach the root of the matter. The large demand for the Form is sufficiently explained by the fact of its authorization and advertisement, and proves little more than a readiness for experiment. As regards the wording of the suffrages, the significant thing is not that so much needed to be altered, but so little: but that little mattered. A precisely similar situation arose in connection with the Revised Prayer Book. The late Dean of Peterborough (Dr. Page) wrote more than once to *The Times* pointing out errors of style, and pleading that the book should be submitted to men of independent literary distinction for their criticism. We imagine that the Professors of English Literature at our Universities would gladly have given time and trouble to such a task, if they had been invited: but nothing was done. In the present case a similar, if simpler, procedure could surely have been adopted.

But the real issue concerns the substance of the Form of Service; and here we wish especially to emphasize two points. The first is an omission—the omission of thanksgiving. Thanksgiving is the natural expression of that "objective worship," to use Professor Pratt's phrase, which is so characteristic of Scripture. Thanksgiving is the best of all medicine for fear, and fear is to-day, perhaps, the most devastating of sins: and it is in the light of God's abundant mercies to our country that our shortcomings become most visible to us. We are bold to

say that what people most need now is not penitence but faith (which is indeed its foundation)—faith in the God and Father of all who still has a purpose and vocation for our country and for every citizen within it. And the second point is the confusion which we feel in the Form between the functions of prophecy and of prayer. Dr. Lowther Clarke writes of the very starkness of the phrasing helping "to impress the lesson." But the impressing of lessons is the function of preaching rather than of prayers. The prophet is perfectly right to be ahead of public opinion—that is indeed his job. But prayers, which are for general use on a national occasion, cannot go ahead of public opinion without provoking reaction and dividing people where most we want them united. Their anonymity, though rightly discarded after the event, was inevitable at the time; and anonymity carries with it the assumption that the work represents the corporate, not the individual, mind.

We wish, however, to close on a constructive note. Occasions are bound to arise from time to time when special Forms of Service are needed; and we agree with Dr. Lowther Clarke that these should be authorized, either on a provincial or a national basis. But we do not think that, in the pressure of modern life, those in positions of authority can possibly give to the composition of such Forms the *limæ labor* which they need. We have no doubt, on the other hand, that the requisite gifts exist in the Church today no less than in earlier centuries; and we should like to see them called in aid. It would not be difficult, we think, to form a permanent committee of five persons, who have shown sufficient aptitude for this kind of work to warrant their being entrusted with it on a larger and more official scale; and we hope that the appointment of such a committee may receive consideration.

NEW VIEWS ON EZEKIEL

As a starting-point let us take the traditional view. Ezekiel, a native of Jerusalem, was carried away to Babylonia in 597 B.C. with the first captivity. Thirteen sections of the Book are dated from that year. The young priest found himself in the Jewish colony at Tel-Abib on the Kebar, a canal or tributary of the Euphrates; and it was there, after a sojourn of five years, that he saw the overwhelming vision of Jahveh which determined his career as a prophet. The task committed to him was a stern one—a sterner can hardly be imagined: to rouse his countrymen, against their will and in the teeth of opposition, to a sense of guilt, and to warn them that they would shortly pay the penalty for degradation in conduct and disloyalty in religion. The prophet betrays no sympathy with his fellow-Israelites; he is heart and soul on Jahveh's side. Darkness overhangs the situation; it is not indeed too late for repentance, but there can be no escape; Jerusalem's days are numbered; the destruction of temple and city, the break-up of the national life, are close at hand. And not only Israel, but the nations round, especially Phœnicia and Egypt, receive warnings of approaching doom. For six years the prophet speaks of nothing else, until the news of Jerusalem's fall (586 B.C.) reaches Babylonia. Then his tone changes; he begins to announce a prospect of recovery and restoration; and in the final section of the Book, chapters xl.-xlviii., we have a vision of the future: a new temple on a more imposing scale, an Israel organized throughout on the principle of holiness, and Jahveh enthroned at the centre of the restored community. The Book is calculated to make a powerful, if bewildering, impression. It begins with a vision and ends with a vision, and a visionary strain runs through it all, demanding an effort of imagination if we would follow, with any kind of sympathy, the behaviour of a highly psychic temperament. Again, the Book unrols long stretches of denunciations which, we feel, are apt to lose their edge by repetition; yet the monotonous prose is relieved by outbursts of verse, the work of an artist on fire with passion. And further, the theology of Ezekiel has its forbidding side: the motive of the divine action in scourging Israel and retaliating on the heathen is "that they may know that I am Jahveh"; again and again the sentence is repeated; God's honour seems to be at stake; let the world go to ruin, let the nation and each member of it perish, so that God remain and His kingdom be established! This is not the religion of the average man, or of official circles; but it is a religion for heroes, and Ezekiel was one of them.*

* See Kittel, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (1927), iii., p. 169.

So much for the Book as it stands, full of strange contrasts and, when we look below the surface, full of difficulties. Some of them are specially important. For the sake of clearness the problems may be grouped under four headings, as they concern (1) the text and composition of the Book; (2) the historical situation; (3) the alternations of prose and poetry; (4) the psychology of the prophet.

1. The text of Ezekiel has suffered much at the hands of annotators and copyists. This is partly due to the difficulty of the subject-matter, especially in the description of the ideal temple (chapters xl.-xlviii.); can we wonder that Jewish scribes and Greek translators were puzzled by the Hebrew for a splayed window or a corkscrew staircase (xl. 6, xli. 7)? But the matters treated by the prophet, startling and unfamiliar as many of them were, yet had an absorbing interest for generations of readers, who added notes on the margin, or suggested explanations of obscure terms. This was the other chief cause of the disorder. Thirty years ago a solution of the textual problem was put forward which seemed at first to promise well: very often, in some twenty-three main instances, it looks as though alternative or parallel drafts had been incorporated into the text one after the other (Kraetzschmar, *Das Buch Ezechiel*, 1900). But, except in a few cases, further study has found that this theory breaks down; the supposed parallels are not really parallel; and in 1908 Herrmann carried out a searching analysis (*Ezechielstudien*), supplemented in 1913 by a treatise on the use of the divine Names in Ezekiel, and reconsidered in a larger setting, especially from the theological point of view, in his commentary of 1924. The general conclusion is to show that, while the broad plan of the Book may be the prophet's own, it has been enlarged by other hands; the chronological scheme is more apparent than real; inconsistencies of details and repetitions can often be explained as interpolated notes. To give one example, taken from chapters xl.-xlviii. The bulk of these chapters, we may believe, comes from Ezekiel himself, and the prophecy ends with the sublime vision of the waters from the sanctuary (xlvii. 1-12). But the rest (xlvii. 13 to xlviiii. 29 and xliii. 13-27) is made up of fragments which recall the technique of the Priestly School; they are experiments in legislation, made while current practice was being gradually written down in the interval between Ezekiel and the promulgation of the Priestly Code some two hundred years later. I cannot help thinking that Herrmann is on the right lines, however much one may disagree with him in particular cases, or vary the application of his method.

2. Now for our second problem, that of the historical situa-

tion. The Book, as we have it, requires us to think of Ezekiel in far-away Babylonia, hurling his threats at the people of Jerusalem. How could the prophet's voice possibly reach them? A small company of fellow-exiles was supposed to be listening, but his words were aimed at their kindred in the distant home. We are told that he carried out a mimic siege of Jerusalem with a tile and a shovel (iv. 1-3), and played the part of a captive setting out with his bundle, and again the part of a starving citizen during the siege (xii. 3 *ff.*, 17 *ff.*). If these symbolic acts were performed in Jerusalem, we can imagine that they made an impression; but what effect would they produce on the exiles at Tel-Abib? Moreover, in connexion with these enacted prophecies we read such words as "Son of man, thou art dwelling in the midst of the rebellious house"; "and thou shalt say to the people of the land . . . to the dwellers in Jerusalem" (xii. 2, 19): they sound natural enough if the prophet were in his native place, but in Babylonia how extraordinary! It is a very real problem: the tradition forbids us to suppose that Ezekiel prophesied in Jerusalem, but the direction of the prophecies seems to imply that he did.

How does recent criticism meet this difficulty? Hölscher (*Hesekiel*, 1924) believes that Ezekiel was carried off in 597 to Babylonia, and there saw two visions (i. 4, 28; viii. 1-9, 11; and xi. 24, 25); the first, at his call, induced him to proclaim the final siege of Jerusalem; the second showed him the idolatry going on in the temple; and thereupon he was roused to utter threats against the city and her allies, Tyre and Egypt. The symbolic acts, the other visions, the long tirades, the promise of restoration, the new Jerusalem—the bulk of the book, in fact—are the invention of a later age. Ezekiel's prophecies of the destruction of Jerusalem had been fulfilled: they must be balanced by promises of restoration, which, it was hoped, would also be fulfilled. Accordingly a Redactor, living in the age of Nehemiah, incorporated the older prophecies of doom, and, as a counterweight, issued prophecies of a more hopeful character. To secure a hearing he disguised himself in the mantle of Ezekiel, transported himself back 150 years, invented the visions, even "the chariot," the valley of dry bones, the waters from the sanctuary, and even the symbolic actions! Such a feat of the imagination seems almost incredible: can this be the right answer to the riddle?

A somewhat different one is proposed by Prof. Torrey of Yale (*Pseudo-Ezekiel*, 1930). All the prophecies were delivered in Jerusalem, where the prophet was living, "in the midst of the rebellious house" (xii. 2); the mimic siege and the other symbols were enacted there; Ezekiel never went to Babylonia

at all, except in the fancy of a later controversialist; for, it is to be noticed, the promises of restoration are held out to Jews dispersed among many countries, and nothing is said about a Babylonian exile; Ezekiel himself exists only in a gloss (i. 3, xxiv. 24); the Book is anonymous. The particular sins it denounces are precisely those which were introduced into Judah by King Manasseh during the pagan reaction which followed the reign of Hezekiah (2 Kings xxi. 1-18). Not that the writer of "Ezekiel" was a contemporary of Manasseh—he belonged, in fact, to a period some 400 years later; but he sets himself to imagine what one of the prophets contemporary with Manasseh would have said, and he seeks to apply it to the deplorable state of Judaism in the third century B.C.

The problem we are considering is dealt with in a rather crude but painstaking way by a Scottish scholar, Dr. James Smith, whose work, *The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel*, appeared a short time ago. Quite independently of Prof. Torrey, Dr. James Smith maintains that Ezekiel's call came to him in Palestine, and he prophesied there. The novel view which Smith puts forward is this: Ezekiel was a contemporary of Manasseh, and though he prophesied in or near Jerusalem, he belonged to the Northern Kingdom, and went into captivity with Northern Israel in 722 B.C. He lived, therefore, in the Assyrian age; Esarhaddon is the master of the Semitic world; Nebuchadrezzar has been interpolated. This makes Ezekiel actually a younger contemporary of Isaiah, a conclusion which, one would think, is ruled out by considerations of thought and language; but the argument illustrates the difficulty of the problem: is it possible to believe that Ezekiel delivered in Babylonia oracles which were aimed at the people in Jerusalem? If we can lay aside our western habits of thinking, and enter with sympathy into the intricacies and surprises of an oriental mind, there is nothing unreasonable in the usual view, that the prophet kept before him an ideal audience for whom his words and acts were intended, as well as a real audience who heard and saw them. Such a situation may seem fantastic, but so does a great deal else in this Book, which will never yield up its secrets to a matter-of-fact method of interpretation.

3. Our third problem has to do with the alternations of prose and poetry. It requires no small effort to imagine such a person as Ezekiel, a compound of contrasts, at one time gazing into the opened heavens, at another poring over architectural plans; moods of silence and torpor pass into moments of frenzy; he would prophesy by action as well as by word; he would deliver himself in monotonous rhetoric, but also in eager, glowing verse; and throughout we feel ourselves in contact with a lofty spirit

deeply religious, aloof, austere, and wholly fearless. But are we to picture such a person? Hölscher says, Certainly not! Ezekiel was a prophet only of doom, and he uttered oracles only in verse, generally brief ones, sometimes consisting of a mere couplet: all the prose—that is to say, by far the greater part of the Book—is the work of a Redactor. It will make the point clearer if we give a specimen of Ezekiel's poetry very much as Hölscher had restored it, and no one shows more skill and insight in this delicate operation. The original form has been obscured by later additions; but when these are removed, the poem falls into five stanzas, with four beats in each line: it describes the descent of Egypt to the Underworld:—

Lamént for the thróng of Égypt, and sínk it down
To the lánd belów, with those-who-are-dówn in the pít!
Art fairer than any? Go down! and be laid
With the uncircumcised, slain by the sword.

There is Asshur and all its company, round its grave,
All of them slain, fall'n by the sword,
Who caused terror in the land of the living;
And they bear their disgrace with those who are down in the pit.

There is Elam and all its throng, round its grave,
All of them slain, fall'n by the sword,
Who caused terror in the land of the living;
And they bear their disgrace with those who are down in the pit.

There is Meshek and all its throng, round its grave,
All uncircumcised, slain by the sword,
Who caused terror in the land of the living;
And they bear their disgrace with those who are down in the pit.

So they lie with the mighty ones, fallen of old,
Who went down to Sheol with their weapons of war,
And their swords were laid under their heads,
And their shields are over their bones.

So thóu shalt lie among the uncircumcised,
With the slain by the sword!

(xxxii. 18-28.)

Here is the genuine Ezekiel, says Hölscher; and he proceeds to heap upon the unfortunate Redactor the *longueurs*, the tasteless imagery, the grotesque symbolism in which the gems of poetry are embedded. Hölscher is fond of such epithets as "tasteless," "detestable," "clumsy." The Book of Ezekiel certainly does make use of figures which are repulsive and, to our notions, unfit for a place in literature: that was the way of the ancient East, and Arabic poetry is equally unconscious of

offences against what we call propriety; but to apply æsthetic canons to problems of Biblical criticism seems to be highly precarious. A much graver objection to Hölscher's theory is that it empties the Book of all serious meaning. More than seven-tenths of the whole is written in prose, wearisome, no doubt, in places, though it is only fair to say that the repetitions are largely due to the scribes, and not to the prophet; but it breathes a spirit of fervent religion and deep abhorrence of sin. Hölscher condemns it wholesale as "*vaticinium post eventum*," "no genuine prophecy, but literary rhetoric," and "fiction"; and he leaves us doubting whether the Book, save for a few poems, more passionate than religious, has any value at all.

4. Our fourth problem is concerned with the prophet himself. In no other book do we learn so much about the psychology of inspiration. The prophet would be lost in meditation beside the river Kebar, when natural conditions would become transfigured into supernatural, and he would see visions of God. Or he was in his own house, with the elders sitting before him, when the hand of Jahveh fell upon him, and he passed into a state of trance. He felt himself carried by the forelock from Babylonia to Jerusalem, where he was shown the idolatry going on in the temple. On two occasions, if not on three, we hear of something even more extraordinary. While still in his trance, he was preaching in the temple court, when he saw Pelaṭyah, one of the leading men, suddenly fall down dead (xi. 13). Three years later he became aware, by the word of Jahveh—*i.e.*, by an inward voice—of the very day on which Nebuchadrezzar opened the siege of Jerusalem (xxiv. 2; *cp.* also xxiv. 15-27). How are we to account for the prophet in Babylonia knowing of these actual events taking place seven hundred miles away? Most interpreters believe that he possessed the gift of second sight, or clairvoyance. Hölscher refuses to believe anything of the kind, and he sweeps away all references to Ezekiel's unusual temperament and experiences as the invention of the Redactor. But such an *a priori* denial only betrays an unscientific temper. It is really too late in the day to set limits to the possibilities of the human spirit; Hölscher's attitude is of a piece with his complete want of sympathy with the mystical and spiritual elements of the Book.

It is interesting to see how Torrey deals with the problem: he has much more religious sense; but he too gets rid of all the visions and trances and instances of second sight by explaining that they are the ordinary stock-in-trade of apocalyptic writers; you get the same kind of thing in Daniel, Enoch, 4 Esdras, the Revelation. Ezekiel is to be classed with these, and belongs

to the same age as (the earlier part of) Daniel—*i.e.*, to the third century B.C. The Book is only one more of the Pseudepigrapha; the writer shelters himself under a famous name of old to win credence for his message to a later day. Reading between the lines, according to Torrey, Nebuchadrezzar and Gog from the land of Magog turn out to be Alexander the Great from the Isles of Greece! It need hardly be said that, with this as the historical background, all the supposed prophecies must be taken as *vaticinia ex eventu*. The Babylonian setting of Ezekiel was part of a literary movement of the third century B.C., which aimed at vindicating the religious tradition of Jerusalem. The Samaritans argued that the tradition had been lost by the overthrow of the temple and city in 586; on the contrary, said the author of "Ezekiel," the tradition was preserved in Babylonia, and you can see from this Book how sound and unbroken it was! One feels inclined to remark that if the problems of Ezekiel are hard, the proposed solutions are harder still.

In these summaries of the new views I have not done full justice to the scholars who have published them. No fair-minded student can deny the cumulative weight of Hölscher's argument as he works it out, nor the ingenuity and resourcefulness of Torrey. The two of them, I admit, have shaken me to the core; but I have come to distrust the merciless logic of the German, and the crack of the American whip does not sound so formidable as it did. Clearly we cannot interpret the Book just as it stands. We must make large allowances for the enthusiasm of early readers, the well-meaning attempts of scribes to explain and annotate, the inevitable accidents of transmission. When we have done this, quite freely, there emerges, I cannot but believe, an heroic man of God, inspired if ever a prophet was, steadfast among the ruins of sanctuary and home, loyal when the very existence of the faith was at stake. You may call him narrow-minded, but the need of the hour was for concentration rather than expansion, if all that Israel stood for was not to perish. His theology may lack the persuasiveness of other great teachers, but it had its origin in the prostration of a soul before the holiness and majesty of God. The prophet was sent to a rebellious house, he was thwarted in all kinds of ways, but he never flinched. By God's providence he saved the faith; and whether we date him early or late—and I still maintain the general accuracy of the tradition—no prophet exercised a deeper influence upon the thought and practice of the ages which came after him.

G. A. COOKE.

THE ESCHATOLOGY OF CHRIST

I

BROADLY speaking, the apocalyptic or eschatological element of the Gospel consists in the evident, constant concentration of Jesus upon some future, final culmination; some decisive catastrophic moment yet to come; some comprehensive and divine Event by which the Kingdom will be established in glory and the present tension and discord of the human struggle will receive its solution at the hands of God.

Those who have gazed upon the Gospel Picture to any purpose, and have followed the Gospel Drama with any alertness, will already have anticipated some such concentration of Jesus upon a final End. For it is clear that if Jesus is, as He claimed to be, of immediate importance to us men, He must be also of final importance. We shall expect, that is, to find in the Gospel not only a note of present assurance and encouragement, but a note also of warning and of quite ultimate finality. And the problem of Eschatology is to understand how this present assurance and this ultimate finality stand to one another, how it is that the certainty of the future catastrophic end does not rob the present process of its reality and meaning, and how indeed the present process is only intelligible as it is illuminated by the prospect of the future catastrophic end.

Now there is no doubt at all where we are to look for our desired solution. It is for lack of looking in this single necessary direction that interpreters of the Gospel story have left us, on the one hand, with a tremendous but incomprehensible Jesus, dominated by apocalyptic hopes, and brushing impatiently aside as valueless everything that makes up human life as we now know it; or, on the other hand, a Jesus with no apocalyptic outlook at all, whose Kingdom—ethical, indeed, but entirely of this world—will develop, if you only give it time enough, by the same sure process as that which, in the sphere of vegetable growth, brings from the seed once sown, first the blade, then the ear, and then the full corn in the ear. Both these interpretations have been manufactured by the simple method of concentrating upon one section of the Teaching of Jesus and upon one section of the Life of Jesus to the total exclusion of the other section. But it is to Jesus Himself that we must look for the solution to our problem, if any solution is to be found at all. In the first instance it is to Jesus that we must look, and only then to His Teaching. If this course be adopted it will prove as unnecessary, as it already appears unreasonable

to accept one half of that Teaching only, while elaborately explaining away the other.

There may indeed be easily distinguished, within the apocalyptic predictions of Jesus, two Comings, of which the first is imminent and is to occur within the lifetime of those in whose ears the prediction was uttered, while the second, whether near or distant, will come when the Father wills. Of these two Comings, the first is described as the Coming of the Son of Man with clouds, or the Coming of the Kingdom of God in power; the second as the Coming of the Son of Man with glory, or with the holy angels.

On the other hand, while for the disciples of Jesus at the time when these words were spoken the two Comings were both future, so far as Jesus Himself was concerned, the first Coming was already present as an accomplished fact. In His Person, but for the moment in His Person alone, the Kingdom of God was already come in power, as His mighty acts attested. Similarly, the effect of the Ascension and of Pentecost was to establish the Kingdom of God in power among *men*, and in the Person of Jesus Himself to establish that same Kingdom in glory. The Kingdom came in power at Pentecost* *because* the Son of Man had been glorified.†

Now every word of Jesus is a word of the Kingdom, every word of Jesus refers implicitly to a Coming of the Son of Man. The Coming and the Kingdom are the same thing. Again, the Coming and the Kingdom are, in the first place and essentially, the Act of God—something which men are to receive with welcome and in loyal faith, something to which they must respond, and which on that condition, and on that condition alone, will deliver them from evil of every kind, and change man and his world from what they are to what they should be.

And so we get the idea of a process, of a steady, gradual growth. We are apt, therefore, to think of the Kingdom of God, on the analogy of vegetable life, as something which was planted upon earth two thousand years ago, and which has been smoothly expanding ever since, and will continue indefinitely to expand until at last the whole world is an orderly, cultivated, fruitful garden of the Lord. But such an idea is mistaken, and the mistake is one which is extremely superficial. A moment's reflection should suffice to make it clear that this idea of a Kingdom *purely* immanent, smoothly evolving from within, is false to the facts of life as we know them, false to the whole trend of the Lord's teaching, false, above all, to His consistent presentation of the Kingdom as a coming rather than a product—something given from above.

* Acts i. 8. † John vii. 39.

It is true that we are presented from the start with two stages in the Coming of the Kingdom; true that there is the Coming of the Son of Man in power, a Coming which, with the Resurrection, the Ascension, and the Pentecostal outpouring, actually took place, and which continues and persists; true also that there is a Coming of the Son of Man in manifest glory, for which we still look. But the first Coming itself is a catastrophic coming, a crisis and a test—a life of incidents and chances.

Within the limits of the present article it is not possible to consider in detail the characteristics of this first Coming—the drama, that is, of the life of the Kingdom of God as it is now actually established upon earth. But it may be well to examine briefly those Parables of the Kingdom which refer primarily to the first stage of its establishment—to the Coming in power, though not yet in glory, of the Son of Man.

Among such parables those which are drawn from the familiar phenomena of vegetable growth predominate. The Word of the Kingdom is like seed scattered by a sower. So far, then, it might appear that those interpreters are right who see in the Kingdom of God a steady process of gradual yet sure development. But this interpretation overlooks exactly the essential point. For the soil here is itself active and responsible, with a part to play. It is in the light of the Parable of the Sower that all the seed parables must be interpreted.

In the light of the Parable of the Sower the Parable of the Fruit-bearing Earth yields up its full meaning. "So is the Kingdom of God, as if a man should cast seed upon the earth; and should sleep, and rise night and day, and the seed should spring up and grow, he knoweth not how. The earth yieldeth fruit of herself; first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear. But when the fruit alloweth, he sendeth forth the sickle, because the harvest is come."*

The primary intention of the parable is to declare the all-embracing activity of God. The sower can count on the seed to grow, because God is Himself constantly active in those among whom it is sown. The prime movers are God and the seed, and the result is beyond anything which the soil, or even the sower, can anticipate or understand. None the less, without the action—steady and faithful—of the sower, the seed would never have been sown, while without the action of the soil it would never have borne fruit. Thus the Kingdom of God comes—and must vividly and faithfully be accepted and understood as coming—from God Himself. But it is the necessary condition of its coming that man shall actively and loyally

* Mark iv. 26-29.

co-operate with God towards an inexplicable and unseen end. And at any moment man may refuse that faith—particularly since all such faith involves action, effort, choice, and sacrifice. Finally, in this parable the note of warning which attends every mention of the harvest in the Gospels is already sounded, after a distant fashion. When the fruit alloweth, the sickle is sent forth. But what if the soil bring no fruit? Then the harvest will mean for that particular patch, not the celestial granary, but final destruction.

In all the Parables of the Kingdom there appears this twofold action—the initial, primary, purposeful action of God from without, and the secondary, faithful, active response of man to the action of God. This twofold *activity* must never be lost sight of. Thus it is a mistake to interpret the Parable of the Leaven* as though it were a picture of the unconscious permeation of the world by the "principles" of the Gospel. The meal itself, like the soil in the seed parables, is active—a necessary, though subordinate factor in the final leavening of the whole lump. In the Parables of the Kingdom, now one side and now the other of this twofold activity is emphasized, but always both are to be borne in mind. And it is to be remembered that in every case the primary factor throughout is the Divine factor, although apart from the human factor the Divine action itself is necessarily foiled.

Thus in the Parables of the Treasure† and of the Pearl,‡ the same twofold activity appears. The Pearl one day comes within the ken of the eager merchant, and incites him to the decisive and joyful surrender of his treasured hoard. The man who sells all he has and buys a field and begins to dig is impelled to all this vigorous action by the conviction that the treasure which he believes to be hidden there is worth all his possessions and all his labour.

Such, briefly, is the teaching of the parables about the Kingdom as established upon earth. But it has still to be noticed that to this teaching, as to all His teaching, Jesus Himself is integral. It is He who is the Seed, the Leaven, the Treasure, and the Pearl; He who is active towards men, and demanding a response. When it is said of Him that at Nazareth He could do no mighty work because of their unbelief, there is presented to our minds the reality which underlies the parable in which the seed falls into unproductive soil. Similarly, when the disciples interpret the warning against the leaven of the Pharisees as betraying anxiety about the bread supply, Jesus reproaches them for the hardness, the non-receptive nature of their hearts, who have failed to understand the miracle of the

* Matt. xiii. 33. † Matt. xiii. 44. ‡ Matt. xiii. 45 *f.*

multiplication of the loaves.* There is an allusion here to the Parable of the Sower, whose seed fell upon hard ground.

The sower, we are told, sows the Word of the Kingdom. But it is no bare Message that is sown. The Word of God—active, life-giving—is no piece of news merely, however good. The Word of God is Jesus Himself, present and active in His believing Church, and by and in that Church present and active in the world. Just as the soil in these parables of growth is itself personal and self-determining, so, in a degree and after a manner immensely greater and immensely more profound, is the fructifying Seed.

In these Parables of the Kingdom, then, the reality symbolized is the Kingdom of God established in power upon earth by the presence and activity of Jesus within the loyally co-operating community of the believing Church. "Lo, I am with you all the days, even unto the end of the world."† "Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them."‡ To say so much is but to announce directly the Mystery of the Kingdom of God which in the parables of seed or sower had been expressed under vivid and challenging figures.

At this point there comes into sight the apocalyptic element in the life and being of the Kingdom of God. How does this element differ from anything that can be detected in the first stage of that Kingdom as it now exists, active and powerful, among men? It does not differ as being a happening, sudden, catastrophic, and Divine. Every one of these elements is present already. The Resurrection and the outpouring of the Spirit are themselves events, sudden, catastrophic, and Divine; while the life of faithful members of the Church is itself one that is eventful, full of changes, victories, surprises, revelations, acts. Already the active leaven works in the responsive meal to unexpected and supernatural ends.

Nevertheless, there is about this first stage of the Kingdom something that corresponds to the obscure and secret life of the seed hidden in the ground. Even this life of Grace, with its inward catastrophic phases, leaping rather than developing from point to point; even this life of powerful activity, with its visible reactions upon the visible world and its incalculable triumphs over the most stubborn material obstacles; even this life of Grace, at its ideal best, would be robbed of its entrancing glamour and of its bracing sting were it conceived as complete in itself and pointing forward to no final end—an end at once unimaginable yet dimly vivid to the anticipation of the active soul.

* Mark viii. 14-21. † Matt. xxviii. 20. ‡ Matt. xviii. 20.

"To travel hopefully," said R. L. Stevenson in a wan moment, "is a better thing than to arrive." Such a doctrine seriously embraced would make it impossible to travel hopefully at all. And if this is true of natural life, it is clearly truer still of the life that is supernatural. Consider for a moment what it is that determines Christian solicitude for others, Christian charity, Christian beneficence—social, moral, or specifically missionary and religious. It is the conviction of the infinite value of every human soul in the eyes of God, the belief that we are greater than we know, the faith that man is intended to enjoy complete communion in every part of his manifold nature with the Infinite, Blissful, and Eternal God. Clearly, only too clearly, this conviction is a moral conviction, not an intellectual, calculable certainty; this belief is a summons to definite specific action, and is not the same thing as knowledge in the ordinary meaning of the word; this faith is founded not on sight, but on trust. It is true that in the light of this conviction the whole of life becomes increasingly unified, credible, purposeful. But the whole of life becomes at the same time and in the same proportion a call to charity, sacrifice, and effort. Both the faith and the effort would cease if attention were limited to what is possible or calculable in Time, or attainable from within the ranks of humanity—even humanity divinely aided—as we know it now. In a word, we travel hopefully because we believe in a final Divine Arrival, when He who is present with us now, and recognized as present through the gift of faith—a gift indeed divinely given, yet a gift also requiring resolute exercise by men—when He whom, now Unseen, we serve and worship and feed upon, will be visibly manifested in glory, and will change His faithful ones to such purpose as to establish them above Sin and Time and Death for ever.

Thus the apocalyptic element in the Gospel, so far from stripping "the life that now is" of value and reality, enhances immensely its value and makes it supremely and magnificently serious, alike in its totality and in its least detail. The Age that now is and the Age that is to come are not divided one from the other, but are precisely held together, in the Teaching of Jesus. They are distinct, but they are never separate. And so, supremely, in the Person of Jesus Himself, the gulf between the present and the future is bridged already. He who has passed through this present Age has now entered for ever as Son of Man into Heaven itself. It is, and always has been, the indispensable root of all our faith in Jesus as Redeemer that without the loss of a single particle of His complete and perfect Manhood He has entered for ever into Heaven itself. While, therefore, it is true that we are called, in Him, to become

partakers of the Divine Nature, this supreme vocation is not to some angelic status, but to our destiny as men, perfected at last in God.

The two Ages, then, are not separate. None the less they remain distinct. There is a glory to be revealed. And the real meaning of the Last Judgment is that, as far as this Age is concerned, man has *not* got for ever. One day his chance will have gone. God will come to give the Life of sheer Beatitude, and may be unable to do what He desires, because the destined recipients are not ready. The door is shut. The Son of Man comes at an unexpected hour and unfaithful servants are cast out. The lamps of the foolish virgins have gone out and the Bridegroom knows them not.

Thus the keynote of the apocalyptic outlook and teaching of Jesus is the note of finality. The Coming of the Son of Man in glory will either kill or cure. And whether the result in any given case will be destruction or bliss unspeakable depends entirely upon whether the individual is already living—under the manifold difficulties and limitations of this present imperfect age—the supernatural life, with its incessant demand for spiritual activity and charity and sacrifice. The interesting thing to notice is that the condition of entry into that Kingdom of unimaginable Life is never that we shall be fit for it, but that we shall be faithful to the Life that we share now. It is idle to ask whether you are fit for Heaven. Of course you are not fit. The promise is more and other than that those who have shall be allowed to keep what they have. "He that hath, to him shall be *given*." And equally, "He that hath not, from him shall be taken away even that which he hath."* The same invigorating truth underlies the Parable of the Labourers, to whom the Lord of the Vineyard was pleased to give the like reward.† There are degrees of rank in the Kingdom of Heaven, but to be there at all is a reward so wildly disproportionate that it is better described as a sheer gift than as a reward.

Now there are many people today to whom the whole idea of catastrophic action seems to deny the eternal and changeless character of God. And yet it is surely evident that life as it is now lived by every human being is itself, on the natural plane, shot through with catastrophe. Remove from life the element of event and surprise, and its savour and reality would vanish in that moment. To take the most banal and familiar of earthly experiences—the daily spectacle of death; is it not true that death in itself brings a catastrophic element into the most bucolic human existence? The Parable of the Stupid Rich Man comes home to the general heart of man. "Thou

* Matt. xiii. 12. † Matt. xx. 1-16.

foolish one! This night shall they require thy soul of thee. Then whose shall those things be which thou hast prepared ?"* Human life as we know it is a thing with jagged edges. Only those who are rich towards God are free to recognize frankly the essential incompleteness of our present existence, and at the same time to set great value upon the fragment. The mere fact of death, faithfully considered, suggests inevitably that the final issues of each man's life are in hands other than his own. The twin mysteries of birth and death unite with the mystery of the intervening life to proclaim in every unstopped ear the sheer dependence of man upon Another.

The apocalyptic teaching of Jesus reinforces that proclamation with authority. For this Teacher, who emphasized the fragmentariness of life in itself, dared also to claim that for those in touch with God life is a fragment in appearance only. In the intention of God each life is to be completed and is to endure complete for ever. In itself, indeed, God's action is not catastrophic. Viewed from the human standpoint—the only standpoint possible to us—it can be nothing else. The whole point of the teaching about the End of the World is that the creatures of God are utterly dependent upon God. But they are to depend upon God because He is dependable. God's action is never in doubt from start to finish. It is the human response to that action that is in question. Will man repent—that is to say, will he recognize his dependence and welcome it? In a word, will man enable God to act? If so, the End of the World will be for him a Beginning which will know no end. If not so, the End of the World will be for him an End, with all hope of fresh starts erased for ever.

We are so inclined to allow verbal associations to mislead us that we are accustomed to picture the Final Judgment as a great Assize. But the analogy from the practice of earthly courts of justice is inadmissible for one very simple and obvious reason. An earthly judge is terrible to evil-doers. But he does not rouse good citizens to a joy so overwhelming as to make them almost swoon at the prospect of it. Prisoners may well tremble at the advent of an earthly judge. But it would be surprising to find innocent citizens leaping for joy at his arrival. Yet the chief emphasis, in the Gospel predictions of the Final Coming of the Son of Man, is upon the blissfulness of such an Advent. He who endures faithfully to the End will not just be negatively acquitted, but positively saved.† This extraordinary Judge will confound him with such warm and enthusiastic praise as will make him blush for joy. He will confess his worth before the holy angels and the Father

* Luke xii. 20. † Mark xiii. 13.

in Heaven.* Such indeed is the prevailing note of the predictions of the Judgment in the Gospels. "Then shall they see the Son of Man coming with clouds with great power and glory. And He shall send forth His angels and gather His chosen ones from the four winds."† In the same way the meaning of the Parable of the Tares is not simply that the Son of Man will root out of His Kingdom all those who do iniquity, but equally also that He will cause the righteous to shine forth as the sun in the Kingdom of their Father.‡ Indeed, there is not one direct prediction of the Final Coming of the Son of Man in the Gospels where the words "judge" or "judgment" occur at all. Even in the Parable of the Sheep and the Goats the Son of Man is enthroned as King and is not described as a Judge. Nor does He judge the sheep and the goats. He merely separates them. In short, the Judgment is a sorting rather than a trial. It is the making manifest of what till then had been hidden or obscure. And the purpose of this singular Judge is to give an incredible gift. "Come, ye blessed of My Father, and possess the Kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world."§

Nor, again, is it true to say that this Judge merely comes with rewards in one hand and penalties in the other, to be dispassionately awarded in strict proportion to deserts. He comes with a gift—a quite incredible gift, a gift beyond all deserving. Those who receive are "unprofitable servants," even those—if such exist at all—who have done all that was commanded them.‖ They have simply done their bare duty. Yet it is the desire and the joy of the Judge to welcome them into a Kingdom of unimaginable and unfailing bliss.

Thus the meaning of what we call the Last Judgment is that the Lord Christ will come, in the Name and with the glory of His Father, to crown the gift of redemption with the gift of perfect and enduring life.

II

"The Lord Christ will come, in the Name and with the glory of His Father, to crown the gift of redemption with the gift of perfect and enduring life." The Life to Come and the Last Judgment are, in the Christian outlook, indissolubly connected. The question arises whether it is possible for us men to have such a conception of the Life to Come as to make it the supreme incentive of our daily life here below. In the fulness and depth of its reality, no doubt, that Life surpasses our imagining. None the less, it is correspondent with the life of the spirit, which,

* Matt. x. 32; Luke xii. 8. † Mark xiii. 27.
‡ Matt. xiii. 43. § Matt. xxv. 34. ‖ Luke xvii. 10.

as human beings, we already know in part. It can be pictured dimly and vividly, though not clearly and meticulously. It will be inclusive of everything that is already, for us men, as we now are, true and honourable and lovely and of good report. Already indeed—as a little reflection will surely show—every one of such things has here and now a personal reference. They are all things of the spirit, and are spiritually discerned. As here, so there. When you have exhausted every picture of beauty, of zest, or of repose, there remains always a constant overplus. That elusive overplus is already at the heart of all our present experience of blissful life. In itself it is untranslatable and defies complete expression. Yet it is by its light, and by its light alone, that we translate everything else from drabness and tedium into splendour and enchantment. The world is seen in its true proportions, seen as nearest to perfection, when it is seen in reference to persons—whether human or Divine—persons other than, yet sympathetic with, the seemingly isolated, individual actor or spectator. It is for this reason that "true love" has been the spring of poetry.

And yet it remains certain that we see now in a glass darkly, and that the full reality of the Life to Come surpasses the highest point to which our human conceiving ever soars. We cannot rest in persons yet.

"The course of true love never did run smooth." It may be "sweet pain," but pain it often and normally is. Love, as we know it now, is never an ecstasy for long. It is a demand for effort, and a prophecy of something yet to come. There is a "worm i' the bud." The truer our love, the less worthy of the beloved do we feel. Yet—so far as our innermost intention goes—there is nothing we would not do or suffer to avert the cold horror of being taken at our own valuation and scorned for an unworthiness of which we are yet quite sincerely conscious. And then, again, there is a possibility more dreadful still. Those whom we love may fail us.

There is no need to speak of the noble life of give and take that happy human love can become. What needs to be said is that the life of human love at its best offers the truest analogy of the Life which the Son of Man will give. That Life is summed up in a Person—the One and Only Fair. Yet—as human experience suggests already—just because this Life is supremely Personal, it is inclusive of all fair things and persons, expansive, inexhaustible, apart from all change or weariness or care. The Coming of that Person changes all who are capable of change. And the terror of the Judgment-Coming lies solely in the fact that it will be definitive. We shall be taken as we are. Or, in the terse and vivid phrase of the Gospel, "one will be taken

and the other left."* Thus the prospect of a final crisis in the affairs of men does not in any way contradict the changelessness and eternity of God, who wills always that all men should be saved and come to the knowledge—and practice—of the truth.

No sooner, however, does one difficulty vanish than another seems to arise. For what truth can there be in these strange predictions of the End, the Coming, and the Judgment? Is it not all fantastic, and alien to our rational thought? It is widely felt that the whole conception of some final catastrophic end of the present scheme of things, and of the arrival of a new order of existence, is utterly fantastic, and belongs to some ancient Semitic world in which we who are alive today can find no home at all.

Yet in point of fact the picture which is given in the Gospels of the End of the World, and of the Coming of the New Age of Eternity and Blessing, is not fantastic in the least. It is congruous with life as we now know it upon earth, crowded as it is with events, comings, revelations, unexpected insights, new experiences, sudden shocks. Not only so. Not only does this picture of the Final Coming of the Son of Man fitly crown the life of present fact, and illuminate that life itself with fresh meaning, and endow the human spirit with a zest that is not fitful, but burns with a steady glow. It goes deeper than that. The reality there pictured corresponds with the native desire of the human heart as such.

When those people whose outlook is predominantly scientific, and purely humanist, promise mankind a perpetual life, these promises of theirs strike coldly on the heart quite irrespectively of whether this interminable future is painted rose or grey. The "glory of going on" is a poor substitute for the prospect of a final Arrival. The recurrence of cycle after cycle of life as we now know it, the infinite progress towards an elusive perfection, which will never be attained—even this, which represents the very highest peak in all the range of hopes held out to us—even this misses completely the deep and constant secret desire of man for a rest which will yet not be stagnation, and for an existence which will be beyond the reach of Time or Decay. Indeed, it has even been suggested that the whole wail of heathen philosophy about the body as a prison-house that hinders the flight of the soul is precisely a symptom of this desire of man for an escape from mere recurrence and from the prospect of a progress that will never end.

The whole idea—not uncommon in our time—of the moral struggle as being a thing good in itself is on exactly the same

* Luke xvii. 34.

plane. And yet such a view not only removes the practical stimulus of a hope of final victory; it makes the Good Life itself dependent upon the existence of evil, since the Good Life is considered to be essentially combatant. In the last resort it leaves us with a dualistic universe and a dualistic God. Similarly, in the intellectual sphere, it is profoundly unsatisfying to the human being to be told to "follow the argument for its own sake." Unless there is somewhere an absolute Truth argument loses its zest. And here also is it not true to all intellectual experience that the solution of a problem, when it does dawn upon the mind, comes like a revelation and is always something more than the sum-total of the mental steps by which it has been reached? Is it not true that the conclusion is never simply contained in the premises, but something added to them?

Now if all this is so, we have already, in life as we now know it, a striking corroboration of the apocalyptic outlook of the Gospels. The moral struggle and the mental struggle appear for what they are; and when they do so, each is seen to correspond with the first—that is to say, the present—stage of the Kingdom of God. The real meaning of all three struggles is that, for faithful participants, they effect the purification of desire. Once the desire is purged and single, the flash falls from Heaven, and the struggle is over, and already, in victory and peace, forgotten. The moral struggle of the decent man, the mental struggle of the thinking man, and the spiritual struggle of the religious man agree in so far as every one of these is built upon hope—upon the hope of something yet to come. The words of the First Epistle of St. John may be applied impartially to all three struggles, and only so do the struggles remain possible, because only so are they worth while. "He that hath this hope . . . purifieth himself."*

Thus reflection makes it evident that the apocalyptic trend of the Gospel and the predictions of the End of one Age and of the Final Coming of another are not fantastic. They cohere with the outward facts of life, and also with the inward yearnings of every at all awakened soul.

It should further be noticed that these uncomprising predictions not only appeal to all awakened souls; they serve also to awaken the sleepy. Moreover, upon those who have been thus awakened there lies a special and unique responsibility. All the stern warnings of Jesus are addressed to the members of the Church. Those who are actually and consciously members of the Kingdom as it exists on earth are not at ease in Zion. The Kingdom of God here and now is compared to a net cast into the sea, gathering fish of every kind, while its individual

* 1 John iii. 3.

members are likened to agents entrusted with a master's money with which they are to trade.* But the incentive to orderly and diligent action is everywhere presented as consisting in the constant thought of the Lord's return, when He will Himself serve those who are now His faithful servants. If they support that test there will come for them a day when tests will be required no longer. They who have been faithful in that which is Another's, will then be given that which is irreversibly their own.† They will enter into the joy of their Lord.

Nowhere in the Gospels is there any suggestion that the sure prospect of the Parousia—the Day of the Lord's Coming—involves belief in the sure ruin of those who—through no fault of their own—remain outside the Kingdom as actually established upon earth. There are last who shall be first; there will be many who will come from every quarter and will sit down in the Kingdom of God when others, actual children of that Kingdom, will find themselves shut out; there are some whom the Glorious Lord will hail as the blessed of His Father who have never known Who it was Whom they had been serving all their lives. But it is also clear that the same rule, according to which men are judged by the use they have made of the light they have, makes it impossible for Christians to deny the manifested Light of Christ. In the end there is only one Way by which men come to God. For us it is not charity but treason to say that one religion suits one man and another religion suits another man. Christ is the end of the Law to all true believers in the sense that for them principles give way to a Person, in whom, however, those principles are established after a fashion in which they seldom do in fact establish themselves in their own right. Virtue for its own sake is a high and noble idea, but it is often austere and dry; virtue for the sake of Christ is a convincing reality of power. Christians are truly charitable, serve God and man to some purpose, in proportion as they live in the immediate and constant prospect of that revealing of Christ from Heaven which will also be the revealing of the sons of God.

This thought—in itself almost a truism—brings us in sight of the one outstanding difficulty with which the problem of Gospel eschatology has in modern times needlessly become involved. It is a needless difficulty because it arises from a misunderstanding. The common view of latter-day criticism has been that Christ foretold His own immediate return in glory, that He was mistaken in so doing, and that it is therefore impossible to accept Him as an authority in Himself. We may accept His moral teaching because it commends itself

* Luke xix. 11-13. † Luke xvi. 12.

to our conscience, we may seek to follow His example because that example appeals, we may accept His view of God (after modifying or rejecting the sterner features) because it is beyond comparison the noblest presentation of God that has yet been given. Thus, once more the distinction is drawn which Christ Himself so signally refused to draw. We distinguish the Teaching from the Teacher—after which we proceed to sit in judgment upon the Teaching itself.

It seems strange from one point of view that those who are sufficiently interested in the marvellous story of the Gospel to spend their lives in amending it should so miss the significance of its central Figure as to ascribe to Him a mistake which in reality is their own. For if those predictions which refer unquestionably to the Final End and the Glorious Coming are examined, as they stand in the Gospel records, it will be clear that in no one of them is there any indication of the time when they will receive fulfilment.

Consider, for example, the apocalyptic chapter of St. Mark's Gospel. "And when ye shall hear of wars and rumours of wars, be not troubled: these things must needs come to pass; *but the end is not yet.* For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom; there shall be earthquakes in divers places; there shall be famines: these things are *the beginning of travail.*"* After these verses follows a passage describing the trials and persecutions which will befall the Church, and how (before the End can come) *the Gospel must first be preached to all the nations.*† Then comes another long passage referring to the Fall of Jerusalem and the horrors attending it.‡ Only after these two digressions from the original theme is the apocalyptic thread again resumed in the passage whose opening words refer back to the concluding words of the two verses quoted in full above. "But *in those days, after that tribulation,* the sun shall be darkened . . . and the powers that are in the heavens shall be shaken. And *then* shall they see the Son of Man coming in clouds with great power and glory."§ The chapter concludes with a passage in which a clear distinction is made—and a strong contrast marked—between the two predictions so strangely interwoven throughout its course. "This generation shall not pass away until all these things be accomplished. . . . *But of that day and that hour* knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but the Father."‖

These verses are not easy to unravel, and they present many difficulties, but they do not suggest that the Final Coming

* Mark xiii. 7, 8. † Mark xiii. 9-13. ‡ Mark xiii. 14-22.
§ Mark xiii. 24-27. ‖ Mark xiii. 30, 31.

is immediate, but rather the reverse. Yet this is the one strictly apocalyptic passage in which any attempt at all is made to indicate the actual date when the End may be expected. The other predictions, and every one of the apocalyptic parables, are concerned with the suddenness, the unexpectedness, and the momentousness of the Final Coming, but never with the time at which it may be expected. The case could hardly be otherwise without real contradiction. It is precisely because they know not when the time is that men are commanded to watch. St. Luke strikes exactly the same note as St. Mark. In the opening verses of the Acts the disciples enquire of the Risen Lord whether He will at once restore the Kingdom to Israel. "And He said unto them, It is not for you to know the times and the seasons, which the Father hath set in His own authority."*

It is true indeed that the Early Church as a whole expected that the Lord would return in glory very soon, and that they derived this expectation from words which He had actually uttered. The real difference between the attitude of the primitive Church and the attitude of so many modern critics in this regard consists in the view which they held or hold respectively of Jesus Christ Himself. The modern critics tend to judge Jesus in the light of His recorded Teaching, and of the interpretation which they feel bound to put upon it. Disciples of the first centuries of Christianity interpreted the recorded and traditional Teaching in the light of Jesus Christ. Their faith was primarily faith in Him. They accepted His Teaching because they revered and adored the Teacher. And it is on this account that, although they were disappointed of their hope of His immediate return, they were never disillusioned. Still less did they attribute to Him a mistake which was not His but theirs. And the striking and significant thing is that Christianity not only survived the shock of disappointment, not only survived the failure of a hope which, on the critical view, was the constitutive factor of the whole Christian scheme, but survived buoyantly and triumphantly, without undergoing any fundamental transformation. It did not settle down to a second best, but continued to advance upon the same level as before, and to go from strength to strength. Not only is this so. It is also true that Christianity continued to cherish the apocalyptic outlook. The Final Advent never lost its place in Christian life and thought.

Now it is just such facts as these—facts at once solid and gigantic—that most deserve attention. They should serve as signs that we need to consider afresh the apocalyptic teaching

* Acts i. 7.

of the Christ before dismissing it as an alien element in Christianity. It should be possible at once to account for the mistaken expectation of the Early Church, and also to discount that mistake, as being a merely incidental misunderstanding created by their very fidelity to one whole side of the Teaching of Jesus which is of essential importance and is integral to the Gospel.

After all, the task is very simple. What Jesus was concerned to emphasize with the utmost vigour of which speech is capable was the urgent importance of the Final Crisis in the lives of men. Yet, for all their brave hope of immortality, men can hardly conceive of themselves except as existing under the conditions of this present sensible life. It was felt that since the Crisis was so urgent and of such importance, it must be important here and now, and be manifested so to be. Already, however, in the early letters of St. Paul—those to the Christian Church at Thessalonica, for example—you can see the first breach being made in their confidence that the End is near at hand. St. Paul boldly declares, claiming Divine inspiration for his assertion, that the dead in Christ will lose nothing through their premature departure from the earthly scene, but that the Lord will bring them with Him at His coming.* Clearly, once this step has been taken, the proximate crisis of Death will tend to take the place of the ultimate crisis of the Second Advent. Death, indeed, is construed in terms of the Coming of Christ. Like the Final Advent itself, Death is certain to come, yet it will come at an hour when men think not. In one sense the revised Christian attitude towards the Coming of the Son of Man might almost be expressed in the words of the bereaved David: "I shall go to him, but he will not return to me." On the other hand, for the dying Christian, death is a coming of God rather than a departure of his own. His death-day is one of "the days of the Son of Man,"† and for those who love the Lord's appearing it may even be called a birth-day.

Similarly, the Final Advent will come in Time, but is itself supratemporal. In a word, it is the translation into Heaven itself of all that is capable of such translation. Enough, perhaps, has been already said in this article to explain how such a final translation of present life may be conceived. What still remains to do—and it is a matter of supreme importance—is to make clear past all mistaking that the idea of imminence and urgency is still necessary, and central, to all Christian thought and life. We do not minimize by one fraction the priceless value of the apocalyptic strain in Christianity when

* 1 Thess. iv. 13-18. † Luke xvii. 22.

we deprecate the attempt to calculate the date of Christ's Final Coming. It had been declared from the very beginning of the Gospel that the Kingdom of God does not come with observation.

It is often said that much has been lost through the disappearance of the expectation of Christ's immediate return, that the keen edge of the primitive eagerness has been blunted. But such a contention is not borne out even by the New Testament evidence. Nowhere does the Christian eagerness appear more freshly than in the Gospel of St. John, yet in this Gospel the apocalyptic hope already appears transmuted. The future hope is there largely replaced by a present certainty of faith. It is not so much that if the Christian persevere he will one day be rewarded by the gift of Life Eternal. That Life is already in his possession. "He that believeth on the Son *hath* eternal life."* And if the expectation in its cruder form is already vanishing in the New Testament period itself, how are we to explain the triumphant martyrdoms of the third century if that cruder expectation is essential, and not accidental, to the zest and vigour of discipleship?

Clearly there is something further involved in the apocalyptic hope than the expectation of a happening which, according to the measure of human time, is to take place very soon. It is for this reason that in the genuinely apocalyptic utterances of Jesus—those, I mean, which refer unmistakably to the End of the World—the note of time is all but absent.

But it would be a disastrous error to dismiss these utterances as of little moment just when we are in the way of appreciating them at their true worth. They are more than helpful pictures. They are parables. That is to say, they do not exaggerate the actual truth, but rather—through the inevitable inadequacy of human language—fall short of the reality, to which they none the less directly point. Thus they are not to be interpreted as meaning merely that we are to live *as if* the End of the World was imminent. From the spiritual, that is to say from the personal, point of view—the only point of view that is of supreme concern—the End *is* imminent. When the Kingdom of God is established above Time for ever, it will seem as if no opportunity of preparing for it had been given us at all. In fact, of course, the time of preparation is the present moment, no matter how indefinitely that moment may extend. The action of God is not arbitrary in itself; its result is dependent upon our life and upon our spiritual activity here in Time. But it will *appear* arbitrary. The faithful and the unfaithful alike will be taken by surprise. There will be no

* John iii. 15, 36, v. 24, vi. 54, x. 10, x. 28, xvii. 3.

proportion, to our thinking, between the final "result" and the precedent cause. The comment in either case will be in the nature of a gasp. Yet there will be nothing irrational about this decisive culmination. Already in our present experience we have a foretaste in little of what a decisive event means. Already when some bitter consequence results, those who reap only what they sow are horror-struck, incredulous, protesting, and exclaim that if they had only *known* they would never have done this or that, or that they would never have left this or that undone. Already when some blissful consequence results, those who reap only what they sow are overjoyed, incredulous, exultant, and exclaim, according to their temper, that they are the luckiest of men, or that the goodness of God is past all searching out. And in each case the exclamation is justified. Men reap only what they sow, *but the reaping is far in excess of the sowing.*

The apocalyptic teaching of Jesus is a repetition of this theme *in excelsis*. It thus brings the two Worlds together. But this is not done by drawing an inference from the less to the greater. The apocalyptic teaching of Jesus is no inference, but a revelation. It is given with authority, and that authority His own. The Coming One is none other than Himself. Here, as everywhere, this Teacher is integral with His own teaching.

It is possible to accept the whole of Jesus' teaching about the nature and the conduct and the issues of human life because that teaching is reasonable and coheres with experience. But the very fact that this is so suggests that there is a more excellent way—more excellent from the point of view of reason itself. If One who so illuminates our life consistently subordinates His teaching to Himself, if One so supremely sane sets Himself at the centre both of this world and of that which is to come, if One so manifestly human proclaims Himself, in character and claim and act, Son of God and Saviour of Mankind, it is the part of reason to take Him at His word. To do otherwise—to accept the rind of His teaching and reject the core—is surely to cast a reflection not so much upon His sanity as upon our own. It is to judge ourselves unworthy of Eternal Life and to deny the splendid destiny of our humanity, at once revealed and restored in Him.

DOUGLAS EDWARDS.

THE ENGLISH USURER. OR, USURY CONDEMNED

In the Exeter Cathedral Library amongst a large number of pamphlets printed in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, is one by John Blaxton entitled: "The English Usurer. Or, Usury Condemned, by the most learned, and famous Divines of the Church of England, and dedicated to all His Majesties subjects, for the stay of further increase of the same." This is followed by a quotation from Calvin: "A deo plus quam rarum est eundem esse hominom probum et foeneratorem: It is more than rare (or it is very seldome seene,) that one and the same person, should be both an honest man, and an usurer."

At the outset, it must be pointed out that this treatise by Blaxton was written from a theological standpoint, and it is not an economic study of the practice of usury.

A short sketch of the attitude of the Church is necessary as an introduction to this tract. During the later years of the fifteenth century the economic doctrine of the Canon Law was evolved; it was based on theology, as a branch of Christian ethics. This canonist doctrine was the outcome of the teaching of the Church from the earliest times, and what had previously been a collection of untabulated maxims now became a regulated and systematic branch of ecclesiastical law. We find much space devoted to this system in treatises of general theological interest, in manuals for confessors, and in textbooks dealing with Canon Law. Casuists and canonists wrote treatises on contracts, exchange, money and usury. Ashley, in his *Economic History*, vol. i., chap. vi., has pointed out that "the peculiarly rapid growth of the canonist doctrine in the later fourteenth century was due to many causes, besides the expansion of trade and the appearance of new business methods. Not until the Council of Vienne in 1311 did the Western Church take the final step of absolutely refusing to recognize all secular legislation in favour of usury, and the prohibition of usury was the central point of canonist teaching."

There are not many details available concerning the life of John Blaxton. His name appears in the register of Emmanuel College, Cambridge. He entered the college in 1610, and graduated B.A. 1613-14, M.A. 1617. He was ordained deacon and priest at Peterborough. From 1621 to 1662 he was Vicar of Osmington, Dorset, and his period there included the changes and vicissitudes of the Commonwealth and Restoration. He is described in Hutchings' *History of Dorset* as "a painful

minister and orthodox in his doctrines." The Rev. T. F. Forth, the present Vicar of Osmington, to whom I am indebted for this quotation, adds that "painful" should be interpreted "painstaking." His orthodoxy evidently stood the test of the Puritan period.

John Blaxton's pamphlet was printed in 1634. A quaint illustration prefaces his writing. It shows the usurer in tall hat and furred coat seated at his table, and his hands are stretched out over the money which is scattered about, loose and in bags, amongst the bills and scales. Behind him a lively devil is perched, his claws ready to clutch the "covetous wretch." In the other compartment of the illustration swine are portrayed:

> "The *covetous wretch*, to what may we compare,
> better than *swine*: both of one nature
> are, One *grumbles*, the other *grunts*:
> both grosse, and dull, hungry *still*
> *feeding*, and yet never *full*.
> Resemblance from their *habits* may be had,
> the one in *Furre*, th' other in Bristles clad."

Before proceeding to his argument, Blaxton quotes three poems. One, entitled *On Usurers*, is by Francis Quarles (1592-1644).

> "Of all men, us'rers are not least accurst,
> They robbe the Spittle, pinch the afflicted worst:
> In others griefe they'r most delighted in,
> Whilst Givers suffer for the Takers sinne:
> O how unjust a trade of life is that,
> Which makes the lab'rers, leane, th' idle, fat!"

In support of his theory, Blaxton defines usury in chapter i., and he points out that whereas: "it belongeth to the nature of lending that it be free and liberall," the practice of usury is "for gaine," that is to say it is any addition "over and above the Principall," and this applies not only to money but also to "corne, wine, oyle," etc. He refers to usury, in Hebrew, Neshek, in Latin, Fœnus, in Greek, τόκος.

Usury is distinguished from other contracts in two main ways. It is not a donation or free gift because "it is illiberal and for gaine," and it is not lawful buying because in that there is "a perpetuall alienation of money, in usury but for a time."

In the third chapter, Blaxton cites the evidence of six bishops, amongst them Jewell, who regards the usurer as one who "wisheth that all others may lacke, and come to him, and borrow of him." And in graphic language he shows how all the ills of the world spring from this practice, which is rightly abhorred by all degrees and professions of men. Bishop Lakes

says: "While the Gentleman depopulates the Country, and the usurer and victuler are become the chiefe Trades-men of Incorporations, what wonder if contrary to Gods Law and the Kings, the whole Land be filled with miserable poore."

George Downam, Bishop of Derry, sees in the usurer a man who wishes to be a law unto himself; his "whole endeavour is to settle himselfe, and his estate . . . out of the gunshot of Gods providence: he will not deale by Husbandry, or traffique, because of the hazards whereunto eyther of both is subject."

This voluntary separation from God and deliberate alienation from Him completes the final ruin of the usurer. He "is guilty of his owne overthrow"; as Leo said: "Fœnus pecuniæ, funus est animæ." Amongst other divines, Dr. Willet points out that usury is against the reason for the institution of money "which was invented . . . that thereby things necessary for the maintenance of this life might be provided: but now it is perverted and abused to covetousnesse, that money may encrease money."

Dr. Williams illustrates his argument from the case of Antoninus, Archbishop of Florence, who, after having heard the confession of "a wretched usurer, gave him no other absolution than, "Deus misereatur tui, si vult, et condonet tibi peccata tua, quod non credo; et perducat te in vitam æternam, quod est impossibile."

Roger Fenton, Prebendary of St. Paul's, who published *A Treatise of Usurie* in 1611, is referred to by Blaxton. Fenton had based his argument upon the evidence of the theologians and philosophers of the Early Church, and of the three laws, Canon, Civil, and Common.

Writers of the seventeenth century were past-masters in the art of vituperation and pungent criticism. In the fifth chapter of this pamphlet various similes are employed to describe the miserable usurer. He is likened by Luther to a "worme in an Apple or Nut," insidiously undermining the good estate of a city. He is like the Ivy on the Oke, a Butlers-box with its full complement of counters, a Moath, an Aspe, a Pigge, or a timber-worme. He is worse than Hell, a Jew, or Judas.

In the sixth chapter, Blaxton endeavours to answer "all such Arguments as perswade some to the lawfulnesse of usury," based upon St. Matthew xxv. 27: "Thou oughtest therefore to have put my money to the Exchangers, and then at my coming I should have received mine owne with usury." Here at first sight the usurer's practice seems to receive Divine approbation. But Blaxton carefully points out that similitudes and parables are not to be taken literally. For example, the expected coming of Christ as a thief in the night does not justify theft. Here,

therefore, the simile of usury is employed to denote the increase of spiritual graces, as St. Thomas Aquinas interprets the passage. And so "the Lord receiveth usury from us in the encrease of his gifts, and we usury from him"—a point which is discussed by St. Augustine. Again, the defender of usury says: "I would willingly pay ten in the hundred, if I had need, and therefore I may take so." In this a subtle rendering of the rule: "Doe as thou wouldst be done by," is involved, so Blaxton points out.

The true meaning can only be arrived at when the reason and will are upright. Various examples are given of the absurdities which might arise from a wrong interpretation of the maxim. Blaxton refers to the magistrate, who, because he himself hopes for pardon, does not, on that assumption, pardon the malefactor who stands before him. Further on, he discusses the position of trade with regard to usury, for some men maintained that no business could be carried on without it. Blaxton points out that if men will not lend their money or goods freely then the sin of usury is encouraged. And he sums up the general result of the practice in these words: "The Romans never began to decay, till usury Lorded amongst them, for then private gaine thrust out common profit."

Finally, in the last chapter, Blaxton demands that usurers should repent and make restitution.

At the end of the treatise a poem by George Withers (1588-1667) is appended in which he censures the grasping Landlords, Country Justices, Clerkes, the profiteers and the parvenus.

A few lines may be quoted as summing up the teaching of this treatise:

"To make of Griping usury their Trade
among the rich, no scruple now is made
In any place.

* * * * *

By nature money no increase doth bring,
most, therefore thinke it a prodigious thing
That money put to loane, should bring in gaine,
yet some of these by practice doe maintaine
As monstrous usuries: and nought at all
are touched in their Conscience therewithall."

M. P. CRIGHTON.

IN MEMORIAM: CHARLES GORE

THE news of Bishop Gore's death comes at the last moment of our going to press; and nothing more than a few words of personal memory and appreciation are possible here and now. But such as they are, we cannot withhold them, as we think of all that Dr. Gore was and has been to English Christianity for the last forty years. I met him first, I think, in my third year at Cambridge, when he came to preach for the Cambridge Church Society in Great St. Mary's; though some time before that—during the last Easter holidays, in fact, of my time at Eton—I had made acquaintance with his writings in the shape of *Lux Mundi*. It is certainly not too much to say that he was the dominant theological influence among the undergraduates of that time; and those whom he once impressed, though they might find themselves questioning his teaching in certain respects in later years, yet relied on him for the main principles of Christian truth and teaching to an extraordinary degree. For he was not only a consummate teacher—clear, direct, fearless, penetrating—he was also an inspiring leader in the battle of the Catholic faith. Not only his teaching, but his whole life was a continuous and challenging witness to supernatural religion; the conventional and the sentimental, which so often take the savour out of the salt, found their constant rebuke in his example: he showed us to what heights the Church of England would fain call all her members. To hear him take a School Confirmation, and see him bend the service to the solemn action of the Holy Spirit; to watch him as he moved and taught a meeting until he had brought it to discern and lay hold on some great principle of faith or conduct; to hear him reproving disciples for their tendency to shirk studying the big books of older generations—these are things we can never forget. The heart goes up to God in praise and thanksgiving for what he has been, and in prayer that he who has fought so good a fight may rest in peace.

E. G. SELWYN.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE late Canon Lacey was perhaps the greatest English authority on the history of Christian Marriage. In the hope of getting from him the ripest product of his learning, the S.P.C.K. three years ago commissioned him to write a book on the subject. A few days before his fatal operation he wrote the following letter to the Secretary, which, with the consent of Mrs. Lacey, we are enabled to print. In view of our present perplexities Canon Lacey's last words on the subject have unique interest.

"I am sorry to say that I have given up my attempt to construct a coherent statement of the Christian doctrine of Marriage. Does it shock you? I thought I had arranged the lines in the scheme which I sent you. But working at it, now here and now there, I found myself everywhere up against some practice of a not unimportant part of the Christian Church which negates the conclusion that I was disposed to draw; and what is so negated I cannot bring myself to put forward as *Christian doctrine*, however sure I may be that it is in fact true.

"I have always hitherto approached the subject from the side of law, where compromise and accommodation are inevitable, so that the casuist must reckon with them, and the canonist is bound by casual decisions; but now I have been trying to find a firm and unalterable substratum, and what seemed to be such is whittled away to a small number of observations and propositions which will not coalesce into a coherent system.

"It is a disconcerting result, and I am not prepared to publish it, nor, I think, would you be willing to do so. Nothing seems to be left but empirical studies, and the great treatises now seem to me just that, though impressive by their very massiveness."

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

In your December number you were good enough to comment upon some things that I said in the November issue of the *Church Union Gazette* about the Declaration of Unity in Eucharistic Belief, which was issued to the Press in October last, with a kindness which I will try to deserve.

But I should like to say a few words in explanation of my criticism of Clause 3 in that Declaration, as well as of Clause 8.

I took exception to Clause 3 on the ground that it studiously avoids in any sort of way indicating the exact moment in the Liturgy at which the Consecration of the Elements really does take place.

In making my comment I was thinking of the probable effect of the wording of the Clause on the mind of the average unlearned worshipper.

Of course I do not think that to settle the "moment" at which Consecration takes place is a "*sine qua non* of orthodox Eucharistic Belief." Again, I agree that any such "moment" is indeed not "real and theological." For every Mass is "One"—a whole and coherent action, having the quality of Eternity. In it there is neither "before" nor

"after," strictly speaking: and, looked at from that point of view, the act has no "moments."

But it is also true that every Mass is offered "in time," and has, therefore, to the perception of the worshipper, "moments" in its own action, as the sacrificial process moves onward from point to point, step by step, to its proper climax.

To say that the "moment" at which that climax is reached is a matter "purely liturgical and practical" is to utter a truism in which (except that the word "purely" seems to carry with it some slight suggestion of disparagement) I should readily concur.

I need not argue the liturgical aspect, but I want to emphasize the practical value of the recognition of such a "moment," which is, of course, important, not so much to the philosophic and sophisticated mind of the trained theologian as to that of the average unsophisticated worshipper, to whom, in his multitudes, the Declaration is addressed, as well as to the clergy. To him the wording of Clause 3 will cause real difficulty. Once he begins to ask "When?" and "Where?" and can get no definite answer, he becomes vaguely bewildered. He wants the bell or something like that; he wants, and, I think, must have his "moment." Otherwise his bewilderment may easily degenerate into doubt, and his doubt into disbelief.

Twenty-five years in a Birmingham slum parish taught me the absolute necessity of clear-cut and definite teaching, so far as it may lawfully be had and given, in such matters as these.

Then again, with regard to Clause 8, and my criticism of its phraseology, I had in mind the ordinary worshipper. My real difficulty is the use of the word "completion." We are desperately trying to teach people to understand the sacrificial character of the Mass and the importance of its completion every time in as many cases as possible in and by the communion of the worshipper. We teach that our Lord offered upon the Cross "a full, perfect and sufficient Sacrifice, Oblation and Satisfaction for the sins of the whole world," and that he, the ordinary worshipper, is able to take hold of and make his own that Perfect Sacrifice offered once for all upon the Cross.

It may be presumptuous on my part—no doubt it is—but I am taking exception to the words "complete" and/or "completion" in the way in which they appear to be used in Clause 8, as though the Resurrection and Ascension added something to the perfection of the Sacrifice already offered.

Surely our Lord's Sacrifice was perfect and complete in itself down to the least detail, as set forth in the Divine Order of Sacrifice in the Old Testament: even to the consumption (by anticipation) of the Flesh of the Victim by those for and to whom, among others, He gave Himself. I am well content to say, with Monsieur de la Taille, that "the whole Sacrifice is contained between the two extreme limits of the Cenacle and Calvary." And I think it is Lange who says that the Resurrection "set the seal of the Divine Approval upon that which had been 'finished.'"

I deprecate, therefore, the use of the word "completion" as though the facts of the Resurrection and Ascension added something to the perfection of the Sacrifice.

ARNOLD PINCHARD.

NOTE

CONCERNING A SPECIAL SERVICE

In the week after Christmas news is scanty and the Press is readily worked up to take an interest in matters which, as a rule, are neglected. So the controversy about the special Form of Prayer put out for January 3 was not surprising. There was never any question of a prescribed form, only of one which was at the disposal of those who valued help of this kind. The form was written by the Archbishop of York, and bore on the cover a note that it was authorized for use in the Dioceses of Canterbury and York. The Diocesan Bishops received a proof and, with hardly an exception, recommended the form to their clergy in the December number of their Diocesan magazines.

The criticism was threefold.

1. Why, it was asked, have special forms at all? Are they not overdone? The Prayer Book services, offered with proper intention, give us all we need. In reply it may be urged that, with the recognized exception of Armistice Day forms, a Litany for the persecuted Russian Church, and the yearly St. Andrew's-tide Missionary Intercessions, there have been no special services of the kind, if memory serves aright, since the Peace celebrations of June, 1919. The present crisis is generally acknowledged to be unique. It is true that instructed Churchpeople can use familiar prayers with intention, but the average casual worshipper needs additional help if he is to focus his prayers rightly.

2. The wording of the suffrages was condemned unsparingly and contrasted unfavourably with Cranmer's cadences. The Archbishop would be the last man to claim exemption from criticism on the score of his high rank, so a personal opinion may be expressed freely. The literary expression of some of the suffrages left much to be desired and, if ample time had been available, could have been improved. But, given the matter, the possible improvement in manner was probably small. You cannot find seventeenth-century phraseology for going off the Gold Standard and allied topics. The critics failed to notice the distinction between permanent liturgical forms, which cannot be too drastically criticized and revised before being sanctioned, and popular devotions intended for a specific occasion. Such devotions are not liturgy and should not be judged by a liturgical standard. In such cases it is best to state your meaning as clearly as possible, even at the cost of losing literary charm. The very starkness of the phrasing will help to impress the lesson.

3. The really serious criticism concerned the phrases put on the lips of worshippers expressing national humiliation. When the conduct of Britain was mentioned, the word used was "because (we have done so and so)," whereas the sins of other nations were introduced by "if." What other course was possible? We were invited to confess our own sins, not those of other nations. The comments in some cases were extraordinarily naïve. "We have not been arrogant. Other nations have been that—we have been submissive" was their gist. I yield to none in my admiration for the idealistic policy of British Governments since the war. We have given a lead in such matters as the wiping out of War debts, the abolition of submarines, etc., which unfortunately has not been followed. Arguing with a foreigner I would press this point. But on my knees before God? I read enough foreign books and papers

to know in what light we appear abroad. It seems to me reasonably certain that a nation, like an individual, is likely to suffer from undue self-esteem. The uniform repudiation of arrogance by the critics is in itself suspicious, from a psychological standpoint. At least on a day of national prayer we cannot go wrong in confessing the faults which other nations see in us. A nation has a continuous life. Even granted that we have purged out our old faults, there is much in our past history which we cannot defend as we kneel before our Father. It should not be forgotten that some of our hymn books include as suitable for Christian worship a poem which by implication defines England as the chosen people, contrasted with "the Gentiles" and "lesser breeds without the law." How should we explain this to a foreigner?

The service was an attempt on the part of one mind to give a Christian interpretation to the world-situation in the light of the Lord's Prayer. It was not "everyone's service," but nevertheless it had an unprecedented sale. The clergy who had the courage to use it in spite of the outcry probably said, when the authorship was revealed, that they were content to err with the Archbishop of York.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Manchester. July, 1931.

This number, as this periodical may be counted upon to do, abounds in good things and contains articles of scholarship and distinction ranging from the Mathematics of Ancient Egypt, Vergil and mediæval Armenians to Pascal, Richard Baxter and Dr. Johnson.

Dr. Conway writes of the Medicean codex of Vergil in the Laurentian Library, with its dated *subscriptio*, by Apronianus, Consul in A.D. 494. The MS. itself Dr. Conway dates in the early second century. He gives instances from this MS. showing how some of its readings shed light on Vergil's mind and art. Another article which contains much of interest to readers of THEOLOGY is a section of the "Woodbrooke Studies" here printed, a Syriac MS. of Dionysius Barsalibi, of which the date appears to be about the middle of the twelfth century, containing an attack on the errors and shortcomings of the Armenians. Barsalibi recounts about thirty-five of their "heresies." It is in their favour that they, with his own Syrian Church, reject Chalcedon, but they are nevertheless gravely heretical in that they are (according to him) guilty of a kind of docetism and of many ritual delinquencies such as the use of azym or unleavened bread in the Liturgy. He quotes against them in this connexion 1 Cor. v. 8 in the Syriac version, "with the *leaven* of sincerity and truth." They also hanker after Jewish habits and sacrifice lambs at Passover, and they re-baptize Christians who come to them from other Churches, they forbid the faithful to read the Scriptures, and many other faults of less importance are duly pilloried.

There is a continuation of the correspondence of R. Baxter with John Eliot, and an interesting account of mathematical science in ancient Egypt, from which it appears that though there was ability to perform many subtle calculations, the papyri have yielded no clear evidence of true algebra so far. There are also several other articles of interest.

W. R. V. BRADE.

Ephemerides Theologicæ Lovanienses. July, 1931.

This number is dedicated specially to our Blessed Lady, proclaimed Theotokos by the Council of Ephesus fifteen centuries ago. The articles all treat of that definition and its implications. The first, "Autour de le Définition," describes the procedure of the Council and some of its methods of work. It accepted the Creed of Nicæa and then conducted its business with great speed, coming to its decisions without discussion, after only hearing the rival statements read. It published no new statement of faith. The material of Cyril's anathemas is all taken from the selection of passages from Nestorius' writings presented to the Council by Peter of Alexandria. There is a second article on the letter of Theodoret to the monks of the East. Cyril's adversaries suspected and feared Apollinarianism and did not thoroughly understand the meaning of some of Cyril's expressions, such as *ἕνωσις φυσική*. The views of the Antiochene school were characteristically short, they do not go far enough to attain to a clear idea of "Person," and Theodoret knows nothing of the *communicatio idiomatum*—in a word, the theology of Antioch is incomplete.

These two French articles are followed by two in Latin which are typically scholastic in tone, one on the merit *de congruo* of the Blessed Mother, and the other on her bodily glorification. The author of this latter article argues that Mary, as a human being and a daughter of Adam, really died, but, as the delayed resurrection of the just is due to penalty for sin and she is immaculate, her resurrection followed immediately. And since in every case *locus debet proportionatus esse locato*, the risen body of our Lady must have been straightway received into Heaven. As she rises incorrupt to immortal life, she must go to the place of incorruption.

The usual very full reviews of books in all branches of theological literature complete the number.

W. R. V. Brade.

Jewish Quarterly Review. Vol. xxii., No. 2.

Dr. Edward König of Bonn makes a vigorous attack on certain tendencies in modern Old Testament criticism. His main points are three: (1) the influence of Babylonian culture on the religion of the Patriarchs is of far less importance than is sometimes imagined; (2) the distinction of a pre-Mosaic period is a cardinal point in the appreciation of the historical books of Israel; (3) the religion of the Patriarchs was but little affected by the religion of the Canaanites among whom they dwelt. While it is hardly possible to subscribe without qualification to Dr. König's theories, yet his paper deserves careful attention.

Dr. Abraham Schechter replies with some indignation to a review of his book *Studies in Jewish Liturgy* by Dr. Israel Davidson.

This number contains many useful reviews and book notes. We may call attention to those on *Jewish Views of Jesus*, a collection of quotations from the writings of Claude Montefiore, Israel Abrahams, Joseph Klausner and others, also *A Jewish View of Jesus*, by H. G. Enelow. The constant looking of modern Jewish teachers towards "the central figure of Christianity" (the phrase is that of Professor Moses Hyamson) is not without interest to Christians; and here is yet one more attempt to throw the blame on Pilate for the Death of our Lord.

R. D. Middleton.

Zeitschrift für die A.T.liche Wissenschaft. 1931. Heft 3/4.

PEDERSEN's article on our views of the Old Testament summarizes in part the conclusions of his book *Israel*. His most significant judgment is that "JE, D and P are designations for collections which received their present form after the exile; all three contain material which springs from ancient times or is rooted in them. They cannot be arranged in a line of evolutionary development, but are rather parallel and combine to give a picture of the manifold diversity of Israelite culture." In particular, there is no room for any appreciable development between Deuteronomy, twenty-five years before the exile, and the Priestly Code, composed during the exile. The Book of Job cannot be dated, since it represents life in a small community untroubled by the problems of the large centres. Any time between 800 and 300 B.C. would be suitable.

The other articles are largely commentaries—on Isaiah ii., iii., Job, Obadiah, 1 Chron. ii.-ix. MOWINCKEL on Deutero-Isaiah comes to the conclusion that the Servant Songs were inserted by the compiler, who took them from a source other than his main source, a collection of oracles which he arranged according to assonance, catchwords, etc. There is no chronological order or logical sequence in the chapters xl.-liv. The writer belonged to the "School" of the unknown prophet. The Servant Songs are by another of the same school.

W. K. L. C.

Zeitschrift für die N.T.liche Wissenschaft. 1931. Heft 2.

This number is full of good things. Professor VON DOBSCHÜTZ has a long study of Κύριος Ἰησοῦς. What did "Lord" mean when applied to Jesus? This is a problem of primary importance. While later Gentile converts, familiar with the cult of a Lord-Sarapis, or other god, may have carried their ideas into the Church, no such associations are thinkable in Paul and his circle. This sends us to the Septuagint, where Κύριος represents Yahweh. There are difficult questions here, and the "Adonai" of the Massoretic text is thought by some to be a translation of the Greek Κύριος of the Septuagint, which was prior to it. A delicate investigation is conducted in an illuminating fashion. F. TORM's article on the Psychology of the Fourth Gospel, though recognizing the difficulty of holding that the author was an eyewitness of the events he describes, shows how improbable psychologically the usual critical views are. What motive led the writer to put out an *anonymous pseudonymous* book, for that describes the Gospel? GERHARD KITTEL's work is always admirable. Here he contests the usual view that James belonged to the Judaizing party; the testimony of Hegesippus is worthless. K. STARITZ has a very fine essay on Apoc. v. 1, the book written without and within, sealed with seven seals. This βιβλίον is a document, not a book, and the reference is to a legal document (such as is found among the Egyptian papyri) written on the outside so that all could read it, with the same content inside vouched for by six witnesses, and then sealed with six seals. The seals could be opened only in a court of law. The seven seals, instead of six, are due to the symbolism of the Apocalypse. E. STEIN shows that the controversy as to whether Constantine became sole ruler in 324 or 323 is settled in favour of 324 by the Oslo Papyri.

W. K. L. C.

The Clergy Review. December, 1931.

This number has an interesting note on the habit of applying for a dispensation allowing marriage between uncle and niece, or nephew and aunt. An Instruction issued by the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments laments the frequency of appeals. The practice is spreading from place to place like an infection. Bishops are warned against excessive readiness to recommend dispensations. The normal grounds for dispensation are "the removal of notable scandal, the settlement of grave questions touching succession to property, the relief of a family involved in great difficulties or in abject poverty." Other reasons, such as *angustia loci* or *carentia dotis*, are insufficient except by accumulation.

Elsewhere instruction before marriage is treated. A priest need put no questions at all to members of his congregation. In cases of ignorance he is bound to *offer* instruction. But if the parties decline to be instructed, they are not to be refused the sacrament of marriage for that reason.

To many Anglicans the Roman system of dispensations is a "scandal." Canon Lacey, by whose death the greatest Anglican authority on marriage problems is taken from us, used to maintain energetically in conversation that a rigid marriage law was impossible; it did not fit the facts of life. The Archbishop of Canterbury should claim the right of granting dispensations.

W. K. L. C.

Analecta Bollandiana. Tomus xlix., Fasc. iii. and iv.

The current number contains among other items a study of the prologue to the first Latin version of the legend of Barlaam and Joasaph, and a version in Ethiopian and Latin of the history of St. Abraham the Stonecutter. English readers will, perhaps, find even more interesting an article entitled *Légende et Miracles du Roi S. Richard*, who is also described as *Rex Anglorum*. Who was this King Richard? The only King Richard known to English history was far from being a saint. The King Richard in question appears in the Roman Martyrology on February 7, as the reputed father of Saints Willibald, Wynnebald and Walburga, all Saxon missionaries who flourished in the eighth century and were relations of St. Boniface. The author of the "Life of Willibald" in the *D.N.B.* has doubts about the existence of a *King* Richard, and says that Willibald was "the son of a certain Saint Richard, who bore the title of King and is conjectured to have been the son of Hlothere, King of Kent." The writer of the article on Walburga is more cautious and says that the name Richard is an impossible one, and leaves it at that.

Of Willibald we have an authentic account in his pilgrim's guide-book, or *Vita seu Hodœporicon*, a contemporary work, apparently written down by a nun at his dictation. He is there stated to have gone on a pilgrimage to Rome about A.D. 720, accompanied by his father, an Englishman of noble birth, and his brother Wynnebald. On arriving at Lucca the father died and was buried at Lucca in the monastery of St. Frigidian, an Irish saint who is better known as St. Finnian of Moville. The brothers went on to Rome. Willibald made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem and died (786) as Bishop of Eichstädt, having been summoned to Germany by his kinsman St. Boniface. Wynnebald was also summoned by Boniface and founded the double monastery of Heidenheim, of which Walburga was afterwards

abbess. But no contemporary or early document gives any hint that the father's name was Richard, or that he was a king, or even a reputed saint.

P. Coens has unearthed two documents of considerable interest, and by their means has traced the growth of the legend by which an anonymous Anglo-Saxon gentleman became not only a saint but a king.

The documents are:

(1) The Office of St. Willibald, by Bishop Reginald of Eichstädt.
(2) An unpublished Life and Miracle of St. Richard now in the Library of Munich, which came originally from Saint Emmaras de Ratisbon and is now printed for the first time.

The number also contains a copy of a *Letter of Indulgence* issued on behalf of *Hospitale de Vita* of Bologna, a charitable institution maintained by a confraternity of Flagellants, the Letters of Indulgence being addressed, "Universis de societate devotorum—se super nudo verberantibus propter Deum."

Among the *Publications Hagiographiques* noticed there is a long and eulogistic review of *St. Augustine's Conversion*, by W. J. Sparrow-Simpson. "Le volume de MS. est non seulement agréable mais bienfaisant à lire." A new book on that interesting personality Benedict of Aniane is also noticed: *Benedict von Aniane. Werk und Persönlichkeit*, Josef Narberhaus; also a new life of Savonarola: *Girolama Savonarola. Prediche e scritti.* Mario Ferrara.

Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique.

In the October issue Father Faux continues his examination of the relationship existing between Orphism and St. Paul. There is a stray reference to the thought of Dionysius, and we wish that a scholar of the type of this author would bestow attention on his influence and that of the pseudo-Dionysius. There is much incidental criticism of the labours of Herr Eisler, who scarcely bestows sufficient attention upon the Pauline epistles. Father Ghellinck raises some chronological points in the career of Peter Lombard. His article is a serious addition to our knowledge of the life of the famous "Master of the Sentences." Father Depoorter examines a letter of a hermit at Renaud, to the abbé de Morimond, who flourished from 1139 to 1154. The hermit is unknown. The letter, which is printed *in extenso*, throws light and leading on the steps in the Christian life, and this light and leading come as much from Boethius's "De consolatione philosophiæ" as from the Bible, thus affording another proof of the power of Boethius in influencing the early mediæval mind.

R. H. M.

Journal of Religion. Vol. xi., No. 4.

It would be very unfortunate if a reader were to be deterred by the two opening articles from reading the very able paper on the Problem of Evil contributed by Homer H. Dubs, of Marshall College, Huntingdon. Starting from the hypothesis of human progress as the purpose (or part of the purpose) of God, he finds both imperfection and evil to be necessary prerequisites. If there were no evil, no progress would be possible. Determinism destroys the idea of progress, hence indeterminism is necessary for the fullest value in life and progress. The religious man means by omnipotence that God is responsible for a universe in which His good

purpose can be and is being carried out. Evil and suffering are spurs, by their very pains driving us on to effort towards removal of the sources from whence they spring, and so towards progress. No good is done by pretence. The more evil is recognized, the greater is the hope of progress. "Evil is not less real or less to be repudiated because its existence is understood." It is, in fact, man's best friend; therefore "he should not rebel at it or despair, but bestir himself to remove it. He has good philosophical reason to believe in a good God, for God's goodness is shown in evil, the most bitter of experiences, because thereby the greatest good may ensue." Agreement will be observed with Browning:

"... with, for evil, so much good more."

Mr. Dubs deserves our thanks for giving us the tonic our present distresses require.

Some attention should also be given to Bernard E. Meland's report on "The Modern Liturgical Movement in Germany." He tells us many interesting and curious things, among them that "German Protestants have no interest in the high-church tendency. In fact, they are frankly hostile to it." But a type of service organized around some significant historical personality in the following way is strangely curious:

Theme: Insight into Luther's Home-Life.

1. Luther's home—a place of godly peacefulness.
2. Luther's home—a place of prayerfulness.
3. Luther's home—a place of work.
4. Luther's home—a place of love.
5. Luther's home—a place of joy.

These items indicate the main outline around which the service is to be built. Between each phase of the theme appropriate music is interwoven. This, and another type of service entitled *Lichtbildergottesdienst*, in which the stereopticon is a prominent feature, suggest that there are no lengths to which experimenters will not go when unchecked by "high church" or catholic respect for the considered wisdom of antiquity.

H. S. MARSHALL.

Theologische Blätter. December.

Prof. Lohmeyer contributes an article on "Hegel and his Theological Importance" in memory of the centenary of his death (November 14, 1831). There is also a translation made by Pastor E. Platzhoff-Lejeune of a speech delivered by the great Italian publicist Antonio Fogazzaro, on January 18, 1907, about "The religious ideas of Giovanni Selva." Hegel, as a philosopher, and Selva, as a propagandist, both influenced the theology of their time.

I. P.

REVIEWS

CATHOLIC AND APOSTOLIC. Collected Papers. By C. H. Turner. Edited by H. N. Bate. Mowbray. 8s. 6d.

The Church of England has recently lost two laymen, both of whom possessed scholarship of the highest order and left so much unfinished work as to constitute a tragedy. I refer to Dr. Thackeray and his work on Josephus, and to Professor Turner, whose fastidious accuracy in completing work and readiness to undertake new tasks beyond his strength caused a quite abnormal number of promised books to be outstanding at the time of his death. The word "tragedy" is used in no conventional sense. It is by no means certain that scholars like C. H. Turner will exist in the future. The shifting of intellectual interests combined with economic difficulties may prevent men with such capacities from devoting themselves to ecclesiastical history. Deep knowledge of Greek and Latin, tireless enthusiasm, the broad humanism taught by Winchester and Oxford, a simple piety which causes a scholar to go to his desk as a priest to an altar—such an equipment for the Church historian may come to seem legendary within the lifetime of some of our readers.

Prefixed to the Essays, which are largely reprints of articles in THEOLOGY, is a memoir by Dean Bate, of which it is difficult to write without superlatives. It is the perfection of a short biography, as lively as a Lytton Strachey sketch, but written with affection and reverence, without, however, any attempt to hide the lovable oddities of a bachelor don.

Next to the Memoir in value I should place an essay, superb in its lucidity and grasp, dealing with the Ministries of Women in the Primitive Church. The Essays on New Testament problems seem to me less valuable. They give the impression of a scholar coming to fundamental theological questions late in life and finding himself unable to do justice to all the elements of the problems. Nothing in these essays is to be compared with the Professor's work on St. Mark in the *Journal of Theological Studies* and the *New Commentary*, where he was in his element.

To illustrate the line taken in this review. I personally have never been able to make up my mind whether Ephesians is by St. Paul or only "Pauline." Such perversity, according to C. H. Turner, is due to "those to whom the idea of the Church is alien" being "reluctant to conclude that it was not alien also to the Apostle" (p. 80). Like many others, I can make nothing of Hebrews as an Epistle addressed to the Church

of Jerusalem about A.D. 67. But, says Turner, "criticism which shuts its eyes to such patent historical probabilities stands self-condemned" (p. 81). "Oral tradition" (as a factor in Gospel origins), we read, "has turned out to be a will-o'-the wisp" (p. 83). As a matter of fact, by the work of the *formgeschichtlich* school it has been restored to a position of real importance.

The Essay on St. Peter most of all illustrates this tendency to one-sided judgments. Although Turner's own position was strongly Anglican ("the Church of England has an exclusive claim on the allegiance of English Christians," p. 67—a position that is very hard to maintain), he presses the prerogative of St. Peter in an almost unfair way. On "give to them for me and thee" (Matt. xvii. 27), the comment is: "Jesus and Peter, apart from the other disciples, are, so to say, a pair by themselves" (p. 189). The promise to St. Peter in Matt. xvi. 18 is emphasized. Unhistorical here, it comes from the lost part of Mark xvi., a post-Resurrection appearance to St. Peter which is the climax of the Second Gospel. So speculative a position is surprising in so conservative a scholar. Nor does he seem to reflect that, from the point of view of the historian, as distinguished from the theologian, a Petrine Primacy given after the Resurrection is not evidence. Again, the martyrdom of SS. Peter and Paul in Rome is said to be stated in Rev. xi., the story of "the two witnesses" whose bodies lie in the street of the great city, "where also their Lord was crucified." By these words John actually *says* "Jerusalem"; he cannot fairly be taken as meaning Rome, without discussion.

These are a few examples out of many which show Professor Turner maintaining a thesis with infectious enthusiasm, without stopping to warn his readers that there is another side with much to be said for it. The canons which he applied in his own special field seem to have been abandoned when the higher criticism of the New Testament was concerned. But, so long as the reader bears this in mind, he will derive great benefit from these singularly lucid and attractive essays.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

MOTIVES AND MECHANISMS OF THE MIND. By E. Graham Howe. The Lancet, Ltd. 10s. 6d.

Dr. Graham Howe writes as a successful and experienced psychotherapist, and his purpose is that of giving a general synopsis of the hypotheses and practical principles which underlie his work. This very useful volume contains the matter of twelve lectures, given in connection with the Tavistock Clinic.

The exposition is clear and detailed, and case-histories are given sufficiently fully to be really illuminating.

The book is, of course, written for doctors who wish to practise psychotherapy, and any detailed criticism of its clinical material would be more appropriate in a medical journal. But it is by no means out of place to commend it here to those of the clergy who find themselves not merely generally interested in psychology, but compelled by the exigences of their pastoral work to deal with cases which are neurotic as well as spiritual. No better outline has yet been given of the general theory upon which a majority of our best English psychotherapists are now working. And if its complexity is a surprise to some who are new to the subject, a very little intimate experience with patients or penitents will suffice to show that nothing less complex would be adequate. For though the "motives and mechanisms" involved are in fact fairly few and fairly simple, their manifestations are so Protean and so hard to read with certainty that even now psychopathology is more an art than a science, and often we feel (as perhaps sometimes in reading these pages) that we trust the experience of our adviser more than his formulæ. This book will not only be a help to those clergy who wish to take modern psychology into account, but also a very necessary warning that any light-hearted and superficial employment of psychological methods and interpretations is likely to do more harm than good.

A few comments upon the book may be ventured, bearing in mind the kind of reader who is most likely to see this review. Dr. Graham Howe lays a very necessary emphasis (which those who have come across the work of Stekel or Ferenczi will appreciate) against the danger of generalizing and so of treating individuals as though they were types. Every case is individual, and every symptom, however symbolic, has an individual reference (see p. 47). So again the earlier Freudian view that symptoms go back to special and early incidents, or *traumata*, must now take its place as subordinate to a much broader view of the general significance of the patient's disposition and environment (p. 63). It is this essentially individual reference which gives the book its great value, a value evangelical as well as medical.

The only main hesitation as to the general theory of the book concerns the theory of what is here called "recapitulation," the belief that we have to recognize in each individual an unconscious motivation which rests upon racial history. This puts Jung's well-known and very difficult hypothesis in a clearer and more attractive form. But it still remains a hypothesis. The clinical facts are not in question, and are of

great importance. It may yet be true that they derive more directly from childish (and perhaps ante-natal) experience than psychologists of this school allow. At present there are some, at least, to whom the explanatory theory is no explanation, but an added difficulty.

Other detailed points may be mentioned. In the discussion of phantasy (pp. 33, 34) it would have been worth while to note the possibility and importance of phantasy that is creative. Where phantasy has a forward reference, and is not merely regressive, it may be of the greatest help in treatment. A castle in the air is well worth having to one who sets about building a castle on earth to its model.

The discussion of dreams (pp. 48 *ff.*) might have a note on recurrent dreams, which are a perplexity to many, and which have a significance of their own. And what is a good scientist doing with such a sentence as that which suggests that perhaps many dreams are "just dream imagination, play without purpose, without meaning in themselves" (p. 51)? Even insoluble problems may not be so lightly surrendered.

The clerical reader may find himself perplexed, and even distressed, at certain things said about God, and in particular about the Holy Spirit, and also the Virgin Mary (see especially pp. 102 *ff.* and 121 *f.*). If so, let him note carefully that Dr. Graham Howe is very rightly concerned that we should not make any mistake by accepting as God some mere transfer from our unconscious. "It is surely most desirable for us to try to make some distinction between our *ideas of God*, which are to a greater or less extent derived from these unconscious sources, and those characteristics which may perhaps belong to the *true objective nature* of God, quite independent of our imago feelings and compensatory wishes" (p. 103). The same caution is made again (pp. 124 *f.*) in a passage worth quoting in full: "All that has been said is not intended to refer in the slightest degree to matters of objective, historical validity, but only to the unconscious factors of the subjective psychological approach to what may have its own objective validity. To say that father imago and mother imago are factors in our conception of the Deity is merely to state a platitude—namely, that our feelings about God do not correspond necessarily with the objective truth of His reality. What *we feel* about God is a psychological matter due to psychological factors. The *objective validity* of God is altogether a different matter, but it would seem to be essential to know first of all why we feel as we do about God, before we try to discover what objective validity there may be. Unless we can do so we look not at objective reality, but into a mirror in which we shall see only

the reflection of ourselves, our feelings, and our wishes. To look in this mirror and to interpret what we see is the function of psychology, but all that can definitely be said is that what we see there is probably not God."

Again, readers may well wonder, after reading pp. 59, 60, what is left of the concept of freedom. Let them set against this passage another, in which Dr. Graham Howe vindicates the quest of the ideal: "What we need is to find our individual and social freedom and psychological health in pursuit of an ideal, independent of all unconscious defence mechanisms and other concomitant feelings. The Freudian analytical school has been in danger of destroying and denying life altogether in its pursuit of inexorable unconscious determinism. There is more in life than psychopathology, and the goal which we are seeking is ultimately more important to us than the source from which we have sprung" (p. 169). We need not quibble over the possibility that source and goal are ultimately one. The point is clear and it is true.

It is a little startling to find pride made "an unqualified virtue" (p. 94), but those who read on will find that the necessary condemnation is laid upon vanity. The difference is one of words, but moral theologians would find it hard to accommodate themselves to this new usage.

Finally, the last chapter, on actual treatment, must be noted as especially clear and illuminating.

L. W. GRENSTED.

THE ENGLISH CHURCH AND THE PAPACY FROM THE CONQUEST TO THE REIGN OF JOHN. By Z. N. Brooke, M.A., Birkbeck Lecturer at Trinity College, Cambridge, 1929-31. Cambridge: At the University Press. 10s. 6d.

The Birkbeck lectureship at Trinity College Cambridge has afforded to a number of students not only a gratifying distinction as holders but also a welcome opportunity or compulsion to put into readable form the results of researches upon which they have been engaged. Naturally the lecturer will choose for himself the field that he proposes to survey and conditions of time and space impose and justify a certain arbitrariness of choice. But readers of Mr Brooke's volume will be unable to repress a feeling of regret that the death of Dr C. H. Turner in 1930 finally disappointed hopes of seeing in print the account of the early sources of Canon Law which had formed the Birkbeck lectures of 1921 and 1922; for the subject was one upon which the learned editor of the *Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima* discoursed with an authority which few others could claim. The various collections

necessarily form a part, though in one sense a subordinate part, of Mr Brooke's theme, but he is dealing in the main with practical consequences in a later period. For this purpose the Norman Conquest suggests itself as providing a chapter in English political and ecclesiastical development sufficiently novel to make the choice of it as a starting-point seem appropriate in view of what is to follow. It is true that in another connexion it might have seemed worth while to enquire what precisely were the 'sacra canonum instituta ac veneranda Pontificum apostolicae Sedis decreta' according to which Beornmod Bishop of Rochester, for example, promised vigilantly to live in his profession of obedience to the Archbishop of Canterbury, made probably in 804 A.D.; or to examine the significance and history of the recognition 'quod principatum tenet Romana ecclesia et apostolicae sedis dignitas' in that attributed in the Canterbury Register A to Helmstan Bishop of Winchester in 839 A.D.; or to ask oneself if a depressed view of the state of bishops and clergy in England before the infusion of Norman influences, or the reconstitution according to Norman ideas, really justifies us in supposing that so little was carried over that we can arrive at a reasonably adequate estimate of the later position without troubling ourselves overmuch about the legacy of the past. We may leave the historical student of the future to decide for himself how much of the closing sections of the eighth chapter and opening sections of the ninth chapter of Stubbs' *Constitutional History* needs to be rewritten in the light of the researches of F. W. Maitland and Mr Brooke, while doubting if the questions can be narrowed down to issues quite so simple as has sometimes been assumed to be possible.

Regarded within its self-imposed limitations and in reference to the task which the author set himself in the lectures Mr Brooke's book is something more than a fitting companion to his chapters in the fifth volume of the *Cambridge Medieval History*: it ranks as one of the most brilliant studies of a subject which has appeared for many years. In his introductory study of the origin, use and meaning of 'Ecclesia Anglicana' he calls attention to the varying forms of description—'Ecclesia Anglorum' used by Gregory the Great, 'Ecclesia Angliae' used by St Anselm, 'Ecclesia Anglicana' in Hugh the Chanter *c.* 1127, 'Ecclesia Anglica' adopted at first by Alexander III as by Paschall II and other correspondents of Anselm. The suggestion that the adjectival form is modelled on 'Gallicana' is probable enough. The connotation he would express in two formulas: one adopted by Alexander III in 1173 when addressing a letter 'archiepiscopis episcopis . . . et aliis ecclesiarum praelatis et universo clero et populo per Angliam constitutis,'

the other used by Archbishop Hubert Walter when in 1195 he speaks of 'hanc occidentalis ecclesiae portionem quam in Anglia plantavit Altissimus.' But it may be doubted if we really escape from the danger of any unduly national implications by substituting 'the English Church' or 'the Church in England' as the vernacular rendering of 'Ecclesia Anglicana' instead of the time-honoured 'Church of England' which some at any rate will still venture to hold to be certainly admissible and possibly the only translation which does full justice both to history and usage. Readers of Mr Brooke's second chapter on 'The Western Church in the Eleventh Century' will understand the grounds of his apprehension or warning, but again some may wonder if the simplicity of clear-cut distinctions between secular and ecclesiastical spheres is not a danger against which they have almost equally to guard, and this fact receives at any rate some recognition at the end of the chapter on 'Henry II and Thomas Becket.' The author declines to be drawn into discussion of the antithesis 'Sacerdotium' and 'Regnum' as beside his purpose, but escape is not so easy for those who are following his argument. It may however readily be admitted that the main importance of the book lies elsewhere.

Mr Brooke is concerned to examine the nature of the ecclesiastical law which came to be accepted in England in the Eleventh and Twelfth centuries. His investigation of the character of Lanfranc's collection, of the complications introduced when Twelfth-century collections have also to be taken into account and of the evidence to be derived from medieval libraries and contemporary writers ought to win from any student who cares to see a body of materials properly articulated and interpreted with critical ability a tribute of whole-hearted admiration. It would be too much to say that he has got to the bottom of the Lanfranc forgeries; but he accepts and reinforces some of Dr Macdonald's criticisms of Böhmer and at least a long step has been taken towards the rehabilitation of the personal character of the Archbishop. But the main conclusion of the book is one which is repeated in two or three forms: 'We are accustomed to hear that the English Church selected from the canons of the Roman Church such as it thought fit to accept. If so, some record must have been kept of that selection. . . . On the contrary there is not the slightest trace of a special collection selected for the use of the English Church in any manuscript, in any medieval library catalogue, in any contemporary writer. Clearly it did not exist. The English Church was subject to the same laws, to all the same laws, that the rest of the Church obeyed'; 'The law of the Church, the whole law and not a selected part of it, was the law of the

English Church'; 'The English Church recognised the same law as the rest of the Church; it possessed and used the same collections of Church law that were employed in the rest of the Church. There is no shred of evidence to show that the English Church in the eleventh and twelfth centuries was governed by laws selected by itself.' There are one or two unguarded sentences in passages leading to these statements, but what Mr Brooke can fairly claim to have done is to have provided by an examination of evidence, comprehensive but admittedly not exhaustive, a basis for Maitland's conclusions and his own which may be confirmed but is very unlikely to be seriously disturbed by subsequent investigations and discoveries. Students may be interested to compare Sir Lewis Dibdin's rather devastating criticism in the *Quarterly Review* No. 433 (October 1912) of the late Mr Arthur Ogle's volume on 'The Canon Law in Mediaeval England,' not least in respect of the illustration there afforded of the effect which Maitland's views had upon Stubbs. And there is a possibility which Stubbs of course recognized but which may easily be forgotten unless attention happens to be directed to it: it is expressed in two footnotes in which Stubbs says of the great compilations that their 'reception may have been a matter of course' and of Gregory's Decretals that they 'may be held to have passed into use as a matter of course.' In such a case express or formal adoption would not be necessary and any argument based on absence of such adoption would be robbed of the force which it might otherwise have had.

There is another and even more important issue. Readers of Dean Church's *Saint Anselm* will remember a famous description of the relations of Archbishop and Pope. 'The Pope in Anselm's theory was the divinely constituted and divinely supported father of Christendom, the oracle of truth, the defender of the oppressed, the avenger of wrong, armed with power from heaven, before which the proud must quail; in the reality, he was a conscientious but wise and cautious old man with long and varied experience of the world, encompassed with trouble and danger, and hardly maintaining a very precarious footing.' The Dean goes on to quote also Eadmer's glowing account of the 'extraordinary respect' paid by Urban as well as others to Anselm: '"In assemblies of the nobles, in stations, in processions, he was second only to the Pope himself." The Pope spoke of him as his equal, "the Patriarch, the *Apostolicus* or Pope of a second world."' We need not perhaps scrutinize too closely the precise implications of such language in either case. Where and when certain presuppositions are accepted on both sides certain positions are naturally and

reasonably conceded which might otherwise be contested step by step. But close students of the pre-Conquest features of the old controversy between Canterbury and York and the part in it taken by the Papacy may well ask themselves if the attitude attributed to St Anselm represents any marked innovation or change of feeling. As regards the second part of his book, 'The Relations of England with the Papacy' during his chosen period, Mr Brooke after discussing the position of Lanfranc and in another chapter 'William the Conqueror, the Traditional Outlook' does certainly add to the title of his chapter on St Anselm the words 'The Rise of a Papal Party.' This last section is a very interesting one especially in its discussion of the position of the writer known as 'The Anonymous of York.' The story of 'Henry I. The Maintenance of Royal Control,' of 'Stephen. The "Freedom of the Church,"' of 'Henry II and Thomas Becket,' traced in three very able studies, leads to the point where 'we can see the canon law in full working order in England, and therefore the normal exercise of papal authority.' Yet even so the concluding words show how far from simple the position really is: 'The papal authority and the canon law have the same validity and the same efficacy in England as elsewhere, but the boundaries between the two authorities could never be accurately defined, so that disputes were bound to occur everywhere.' That is a statement which a canonist might well find disquieting; but Mr Brooke has at least this in common with the late Canon Lacey, whose recent loss has left the world of learning poorer, that he must be judged by careful examination of the precise form of his statements, not by what in the case of other writers the statements might be taken generally to mean. It is not unnecessary to insist upon this because the book will be found most useful for controversial purposes precisely by those who have least title to use it; and it will probably be used with extensions in respect of time which the writer at any rate has not at present given it. A special interest attaches to the study of the clash of principles in the struggle of Henry II and Becket, a study which it is worth while to compare with sundry observations of Maitland and one in which St Thomas of Canterbury appears in a more favourable light than has sometimes been allowed to him even by a Pope, as the famous sixteenth-century comparison with Fisher shows. But it is a far cry from Henry II and Alexander III to Henry VIII and the third Paul, and Mr Brooke's epilogue of course only includes 'From the Death of Becket to Magna Carta.' He sees no harm in the use of terms like 'normal,' 'encroachment,' 'purely historical' or in speaking of a 'clash of ideals, a conflict of two opposing rights,' between

which he has 'no desire to arbitrate.' 'It seems to me,' he says, 'far more important to understand than to judge,' and the phrase is so strongly reminiscent of Creighton that we almost instinctively look round for an Acton to redress the balance.

CLAUDE JENKINS.

ARCHBISHOP BERNARD: PROFESSOR, PRELATE AND PROVOST. By the Rev. Robert H. Murray, Litt.D. London: S.P.C.K. 10s. 6d.

In the book before us Dr. Murray tells us he has been fortunate in the material at his disposal: he has certainly been still more fortunate in the subject of his memoir.

John Henry Bernard was a man of rare, choice and beautiful character, of brilliant attainments and generous sympathies. Born in 1860, and left an orphan before he was three, he was brought up by a "noble-hearted" mother in straitened circumstances. He entered Trinity College, Dublin, at fifteen, and after an almost unique record of honours, became a Fellow before he was twenty-four, and Lecturer (afterwards Professor) in Divinity four years later. His biographer clearly shows what a commanding influence he became in the training of almost all the clergy of the Irish Church ordained in the next twenty and more years. And no one could have been more conspicuously fitted to exercise such wholesome influence in the conditions of Irish Churchmanship. A convinced Churchman, too great a scholar to be a partisan, too real a believer to make theology less than a living message, Bernard's mind and temperament had been from early years cast in a mould which shaped him for leadership. Endowed with unusual gifts of personal attractiveness, he combined, as few men could, seriousness with humour, scholarship with good companionship, dignity with youthfulness, generous judgment of others with stern discipline of self. The progress of his life in this book is almost as fascinating and attractive as the man himself was. And so we trace him in these pages, a leader of many gifts and parts, advancing from strength to strength. Within a few years he becomes Dean of St. Patrick's, Bishop of Ossory (after declining the important see of Meath), and lastly Archbishop of Dublin at the age of fifty-five. Then after but four crowded years, the lifelong strain of almost incessant work began to tell even on that strong frame, and, largely on medical advice, he resigned his Archbishopric to become Provost of Trinity College. This office he held with great distinction for twelve years until his death in 1927.

Space forbids any estimate here of Bernard as a writer as

theologian, historian or critic. A good catalogue of his literary work appears in the biography. But we cannot omit to mention one most valuable section of the book—the account of the Conferences which were held in 1917 and after during that critical phase in Irish history. It will surprise many to find what an influential part Archbishop Bernard took in those fateful discussions on both sides of the channel. But the striking testimony of Irish and English leaders of all kinds in this controversy leaves no doubt that he was a statesman of a very high order, who seems only just to have failed to bring those bitterly opposing spirits to an agreement for a united Ireland.

As for the book itself, it is well produced and printed, in spite of some misprints, and a somewhat awkward arrangement of quotations. If it were right to express any regret over so careful a compilation and so obvious a labour of love, it would be that we have not more of Archbishop Bernard's actual words, and perhaps less of other matter. Some will feel the book might have been shortened with advantage. The stage is so crowded at times with other distinguished sons of Trinity College, Dublin, that it is not easy to find the hero. And though no one who knew Bernard would deem one word undeserved of the praise his biographer lavishes upon him, there is some over-elaboration here. To his friends Bernard needs no such laudation: to strangers the iteration of phrases might produce an effect contrary to what is intended. The facts, so ably recorded, show how great he was in his many-sided personality. And Dr. Murray has rendered us all a service in recalling that beautiful manly life in so careful a biography. Many a reader may well rise a better man from its perusal.

G. R. EDEN (*Bishop*).

NOTICES

THE YORK PROVINCIALE. Put forth by Thomas Wolsey, Archbishop of York in the year 1518. Edited and translated by R. M. Woolley, D.D. The Faith Press, Ltd.

Dr. Woolley observes that the codification of the constitutions of the York Province was one of the first things done by Wolsey after he became Papal Legate, and that "it is curious that, though in his preface his Legateship is mentioned, there is no reference to his rank as a Cardinal." Is there not here some misunderstanding of the situation? Wolsey became *legatus natus* when he became Archbishop of York in August 1514: he became *legatus a latere* on May 19, 1518, but it was not till September of that year that he received the Cardinal's hat. Dr. Woolley has failed to notice that the "procemium" attached to Book I. is merely a repetition of Archbishop George Neville's preface to the constitutions put forth in 1466,

the name of Thomas being substituted for George. In some instances Dr. Woolley, in footnotes, points out the constitutions in the book which are derived from Canterbury, but he does not notice that Title I. of Book I., *de summa trinitate et fide catholica*, is drawn by Neville from Archbishop Peckham's Constitutions of 1281. In Neville's Constitutions Peckham's expositions of the teaching of the Creed, the Commandments, Evangelical Precepts, Works of Mercy, Deadly Sins, Virtues, and the seven sacraments, form Constitution VII. Lyndwood breaks up the Constitution into titles and assigns them to different parts of his work. The compiler of the York Manual follows Lyndwood in this respect, and as Lyndwood had done, he places Peckham's moral teaching under the title "de officio archipresbyteri." He prefers Lyndwood's text to the Archbishop of York's, and at the close of Book Title VI. he alters Lyndwood's words "de septem gratiæ sacramentis supradictum est in suo loco," although he has not, as Lyndwood had done (*Provinciale*, Lib. I., Title II., p. 63), given the relevant passage. Title II. of Book I. of the York Book is also an extract from Peckham. Some day, perhaps, an ill-advised enthusiast will quote it to prove that so late as 1518 communion under both kinds was given in "greater churches"! Title I. being ascribed to Neville, No. II. is superscribed by the York compiler as "Forte idem," although it is not in Neville's Constitutions. If Dr. Woolley had consulted the Surtees Society's *Records of the Northern Convocation* he would have saved himself some trouble in regard to readings of his text. For instance, in the explanation of the Creed, the York compiler has "Veri incarnati dei nativitas ex virgine concepta." Dr. Woolley remarks, "*Concepta* must go with *nativitas* and is awkward. Wilkins amends to incorrupta." In Neville's text (and also in Lyndwood's quotation of Peckham), the word is *incorrupta*. Again, on p. 37, Dr. Woolley is puzzled by finding *agnorum* used twice, and suggests an emendation. Reference to Neville's text would have shown that the first *agnorum* is the York copyist's error for *cygnorum*. Describing Lyndwood's procedure, Professor Maitland writes: "Of course we must have five books, no more, no less—index, indicium, clerus, sponsalia, crimen. . . . Thus we shall begin with *De summa Trinitate* and end with *De verborum significatione*." Such a description fits this little York Manual very well. In his preface, the Editor surveys the controversy of the force of the Roman Canon Law in England. If the Roman Canon Law already provided fully for all such matters as are dealt with by these Provincial Constitutions, why, he too asks, was it necessary, so late as the fifteenth and sixteenth century, that an inferior authority should codify its enactments, seeing that the supreme Corpus of the Western Church was at hand for reference? The question admits of an answer which throws no light on the question whether or no the Corpus Juris Canonici was supreme. Local circumstances may compel a local and a subordinate authority to issue bylaws founded on the legislation of the universal and supreme authority, or to promulgate the enactments of that supreme authority, not because without local acceptance those enactments would be without force, but because local circumstances required that the unmoral edicts should be made known and operative locally. With whatever designs for the reformation of the Church Wolsey may be credited, it was neither as the Metropolitan of a Province nor even as *legatus natus*, that he intended to set the machinery in motion. That the Archbishop of Canterbury should reform his province by means of provincial Constitutions was just the very thing that Wolsey in 1518 was determined to prevent. The late Father Ethelred

L. Taunton went very far astray when in his book *Thomas Wolsey : Legate and Reformer* he appealed to these Constitutions as "Models for ecclesiastical government" to show "on what lines Wolsey would have worked as Legate of all England." An absentee from the great see to which he had been appointed without the barest form of capitular election, Wolsey only entered York in 1530. He had in 1514 appointed John Yonge, Master of the Rolls and titular Bishop of Negroponte, to be his suffragan, but it is questionable whether Yonge, who died in London in April 1516, resided at all frequently at York. From 1515 to 1518 Yonge's successor as titular Bishop of Negroponte was Richard Wilson the Prior of Drax, who became Bishop of Meath in 1523. If these Constitutions were presented to the York Convocation in 1518 Bishop Wilson may have been their spokesman. But were they ever submitted to Convocation? The words of the "proœmium" *de consensu et assensu suffraganeorum*, etc., are taken from Neville's Constitutions. In reading the Constitutions which deal with clerical immunities and the secular authority, the reader would do well to take into view Wolsey's action in the Hunne-Standish controversy, and Wolsey's attitude to the right of sanctuary may be gauged by a reference to Dr. Pollard's *Wolsey*, p. 53. To have sent the York Manual to the printers would, in 1518, have required some courage. The Manual does not display any very important differences in custom between York and Canterbury, but it is replete with interesting things. In the hands of so accomplished a scholar as Dr. Woolley the work has been well done.

WALTER K. FIRMINGER.

A STUDY OF CONVERSION. By L. W. Lang. George Allen and Unwin 10s.

This interesting book puts forward a new theory of the psychology of conversion. The author's main thesis (which is copiously illustrated by long extracts from religious autobiographies) is that conversion is a gradual process consisting of three stages, which he calls respectively recognition, decision, and activity. Recognition is the assimilation of an ideal of character through affection and admiration. Thus is formed "a religious self-sentiment," which is frequently found in early childhood in a Christian home. The second stage, that of definite acceptance, is characteristic of adolescence. "Childhood is the golden age for creating religious impressions and adolescence is the age for making decisions." It often happens, however, that decision is not made until later life, if at all. Where it does not occur, according to Mr. Lang, this is due either to a weakening of the self-sentiment, which is the nucleus round which the religious sentiment must form, or to the inhibiting effect of fear. In any case, decision is the core of conversion, which can never be brought about by any amount of religious education. This decision "is whether to be or not to be a Christian personality."

It is open to serious doubt whether, in fact, the conversion process always takes place in this manner through a self-sentiment. In many cases, it seems to be a more natural interpretation of the evidence to say that prior to the formation of a strong religious sentiment there is no master sentiment in the self at all. Only in the case of the conversion of strong characters does the self-sentiment act as a bridge to the religious sentiment. It is somewhat misleading to draw one's evidence, as the author does, exclusively from published biographies, which are usually

concerned with men and women of outstanding personality. Moreover, so far from a strong self-sentiment being an indispensable preliminary to true conversion, it may actually be an impediment to it, since it so easily leads to the deadly sin of pride. The result may be to produce not a saint, but what M. Maritain has called Luther, "an inverted Pharisee."

L. DEWAR.

TEMPLES OF ETERNITY. By R. H. J. Steuart, S.J. Longmans, Green and Co. 5s.

After reading and pondering *The Inward Vision* one would have thought that it would be impossible for the author to produce anything further that could be quite so perfect in its way. But *Temples of Eternity* not only equals, but in some ways surpasses the first collection. There is the same consummate artistry of words—a style that is like spontaneous utterance, and yet so pruned and arranged that each word and phrase are essential. But there is a warmer glow, a more intimate truth, than before. These thoughts and meditations go far deeper than instruction or elucidation. They spring from, and they lead back to, that region of silent adoration where the soul comes to know God more truly than by reasoning. Prejudice and controversy wither in that atmosphere—the Spirit searches the deep things of God. "It is sufficient to know that to be united to God means to be caught up into the eternal Act of His existence, to be in some unimaginable way concerned in that generation and procession which is His Being." And here in this volume is an earnest of the unspeakable riches which that union bestows.

V. I. RUFFER.

MIND AND MATTER. By G. F. Stout, M.A., LL.D., D.Litt., Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in the University of St. Andrews. Cambridge University Press. 12s. 6d.

This volume is the first of two, based on the Gifford Lectures delivered in the University of Edinburgh in 1919 and 1921. It is a very careful investigation of the psycho-physical problem in epistomology, and is intended as preparatory to the second volume (as yet unpublished) on "God and Nature." Professor Stout develops the thesis that the starting-point for knowledge is the experience of "embodied selves," each with his own awareness of a "sensory continuum" co-extensive with all nature. The distinction between so-called "mental" and "physical" facts is not that they are different kinds of objects of thought, but that they are the results of different modes of knowing the same world. Those who are interested in these problems will be grateful to Professor Stout for the close and accurate thinking which this book contains, and will look forward with interest to the publication of the second volume. A comparison of the closing section with a passage on page 143 leaves one wondering whether he will agree with those thinkers who regard God and creation as mutually dependent on one another, or with the Christian tradition of what Dean Inge calls "the one-sided relation of a First Cause to the Universe."

LEONARD HODGSON.

SOUTH MYMMS, THE STORY OF A PARISH. By F. Brittain, M.A. Heffer. 10s. 6d.

This is an admirable example of the proper writing of local history, tracing the story of a parish, that has kept its identity, from early times through the phases of its varied life so far as these have been recorded in monuments or in written records. South Mymms first appears soon after the Norman Conquest; the already existing parish church is part of the endowment of the newly founded Abbey of St. James of Saffron Walden. The history then becomes interwoven with the rise and fall of great families, such as the Frowykes who dominate the place from the thirteenth to the sixteenth century. The Reformation, of course, breaks the old connection with the Essex Abbey. The author describes the movement of the population, the results of plague and smallpox, the village life and the effect of the Civil War. In this parish, later on, Admiral Byng, who was shot "*pour encourager les autres*" in 1757, had his home.

In other chapters much interesting information is given of the Poor Law administration, of the Vestry, the Workhouse, and the Police. We are told in some detail how the Oxford Movement penetrated into the life of the village under a succession of devoted parish priests. Plans for the restoration of the parish church which were altogether unacceptable in 1854, were adopted and carried into effect in 1876-1878, largely in consequence of the faithful work of the Vicar, the Reverend P. F. Hamond. There is also the story of the Church Schools, with amusing extracts from the log books of forty years ago. A little before that the school had the honour of being inspected by Mr. Matthew Arnold. But all during the period the observance of local fairs militated against regular attendance.

A good selection of photographs really illustrate the text and clear maps take the place of endpieces. Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch contributes an introduction.

W. R. V. BRADE.

DWELLERS IN ARCADY. Essays in Folklore selected from the writings of R. L. Gales. Sheldon Press. 5s.

The editor and publishers of this volume have given to us a delightful collection of gems from the Essays of Mr. Gales, and our debt to them is the greater for the fact that some of the Essays are now out of print. We have here twenty-one Essays, sixteen from the two volumes of *Studies in Arcady*, the remaining five from *The Vanished Country Folk*. They belong to the winsome and homely England of Washington Irving's *Sketch Book*, and are racy of the old days before the disastrous advent of steam-tractor and motor-car. Mr. Gales had all the insight of the poet and the parish priest into the beauty of the countryside and the life of the country people. He knows their manner of life and way of speech, and can appreciate its charm to the full. He can see how expressive that speech is, and how much expression we lose and miss in the journalistic and broadcast speech of the present day. Perhaps the most attractive part of this collection is its really illuminating quotations of country speech and country proverbs and country similes. As Mr. Gales himself says, "The old spoken English was a language of people who thoroughly enjoyed their lives, who worked and took a pleasure in their work, to whom the world about them was intensely living and interesting, and who found quaint images and similes everywhere." There are three charming essays on language: *The Rightness of Popular Speech, Town and Country English, On Popular English.*

We feel as we read them what a far cry it is from the colloquial speech of our grandfather's day to the "Right ho" and "a little bit of all right" of our own. With what sympathetic delight would Mr. Gales have read Mr. Baldwin's speech at the opening of a school reported in *The Times* of October 12: "We have lived now to a day when most of us try to talk like the B.B.C., and, in the sacred name of progress, our language is gradually being formed on the captions of the Hollywood films. . . . There is nothing that arouses the primitive wrath in me more than the half-educated calling old English speech vulgar. . . . The old words we knew in this country, sanctified by Langland and Chaucer, are words of a beauty far exceeding those of Carolina and Georgia." We have only to read Mr. Gales' essays to appreciate the truth of those words.

All through these essays there runs this love of the old English speech of country folk, but that is not the only debt which we owe to them. There is the love of flowers and of birds, and of beasts and of customs, and of old-world places. There is the bearing with the frailties of human nature, and the ability to see good where others can only see evil, finding humorous yet kindly-expression in the essay *In Praise of Humbugs*. And there is the tracing of so much of the best in English life to the old Christian tradition, of which, for instance, Mr. Gales finds so much, and shows us so much, in the plays of Shakespeare. How fair and lovely is the countryman's conception of heaven as a meadow! And how true to the tradition which, starting in the very beginning from the Garden of Eden, finds expression in the old Liturgies; in the poetry of Dante; in the art of Van Eyck; and, we may add, in the Vision of St. Perpetua. How sweet is the appeal of Mr. Gales' own words, "Amid some baking wilderness of bricks and mortar it is a refreshment even to think of a green alpine meadow starred with crocuses. Amid the deafening noises of the arid streets, the quiet of the country seems the very blessed 'requies' of the old prayers." Perhaps it may not be out of place to close this notice with the prayer in our minds that Richard Lawson Gales may even now be finding in those green pastures and by those still waters more and more of that blessed *requies* of which he has written so lovingly.

To him and to the editor of this little book the lovers of our English Arcady owe a great debt of gratitude for such a help to the knowledge and love of country thoughts and ways. H. V. S. Eck.

History of the Christian People. By Henry K. Rowe. Ph.D. Macmillan and Co. 20s.

To write a history of Christianity in one volume is a task which no scholar could execute to his satisfaction. The writer must pursue one of three methods: (1) He may cram into his papers all the chief facts, leaving himself little space for comment and none for picturesque incident or illustrated detail. The result is a valuable collection of facts of almost incredible dulness; it is like a corpse: valuable for certain purposes, but when all is said and done, dead. (2) He may make a story and by omitting a number of relevant but less important events find space enough for personal touches and illuminating details to make the story interesting. He at least breathes life into the corpse, but at the sacrifice of some of its limbs.

The third method is to follow the fashion of the day and proceed by way of Outlines. This is Dr. Rowe's method. The story is not told as

a story. We are given the main tendencies, general lines of developments, the action and reaction of religious forces. So far as history can be written like this the author has succeeded; but can it? The method may answer very well in the impersonal branches of science or in the history of primitive man, where *personalia* are unknown, but in the history of the Churches or states, where personality counts for so much, it does not seem to answer. It tends to make history not only dull and nebulous, but also oracular. If the historian lays down general laws and makes sweeping assertions without producing evidence in support of his theories the unlearned reader is helpless. This applies more particularly to a contentious subject like Church History. Dr. Rowe appears to write from the advanced modernist standpoint, and many of his utterances are open to question. "The Lord's Supper, though at first a simple memorial, promptly became a sacrament, as did baptism. The process of transformation began with its separation from the *agape*, or common meal, and its celebration at the morning worship." "The idea of a *magical* (our italics) but real presence of Christ in the Eucharist was accepted long before it was described by the mediæval Catholic term of transubstantiation." Such statements require elucidation.

After taking in account the limitations that the author has imposed upon himself it is a pleasure to add that he has performed his task admirably. At the end of each chapter there is a valuable list of authorities, and for teachers a still more useful list of questions and subjects for essays. There are some slips, as is almost inevitable. Charles Borromeo is wrongly given as the founder of the Oratory instead of St. Philip Neri, but such slips are very few. In fact, the very excellence of the performance is, at least to one reader, evidence that the method is mistaken.

C. P. S. CLARKE.

BOOK NOTES

History in Stones. By C. E. Statham Norton. Sheldon Press. 3s. 6d. A book on English church architecture, for school children, full of interesting information—*e.g.*, why churches in Norfolk were built of flint with round towers; why English churches have high-pitched roofs; the purpose of gargoyles, of battlemented church towers, of the great height of some coast church towers; the development of tracery; how wall paintings and, later, windows were the lesson books for the uneducated; the various periods of church building, etc. An admirable first handbook of English church architecture, with exceptionally good illustrations.

Meditations on the Four Gospels. By A. C. Buchanan. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d. Forty meditations on each gospel, one hundred and sixty in all, with a devotion to our Lord at the end of each meditation. We commend this little book to those who wish to deepen their spiritual life.

Parson and People. Some Experiences and Experiments in Parish Life. By Edward S. G. Wickham. S.P.C.K. 2s. Addressed both to clergy and laity, full of valuable suggestions. By one who has clearly used his imagination and has experimented freely in parish work. He gives details of the development and management of group discussions; of the working of a parochial Guild of Fellowship; of getting into touch with wedding

couples before their marriage; of the preparation and after-care of confirmation candidates. Many other sides of Parish work are dealt with, but the above instances will suffice to indicate the scope of the work.

H. L. C.

The Knowledge of Our Lord Jesus Christ. The Ven. Louis de Ponte, S.J. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 5s. This is one of these books which makes one rather envy the pre-critical users of the Bible. Written by a seventeenth-century lover of Christ, it brings all and any parts of the Bible to witness to Him, whether directly or by allegory or interpretation, and in the same way deals with the knowledge of Him in the Sacrament. It is full of most quaint and devout conceits, and some very beautiful prayers. But the whole mental attitude is so alien to that of the modern Bible student that his instructions lose most of their value for the present day.

A Short History of the Hebrews. By B. K. Rattey. Oxford University Press. 2s. 9d. This is a kind of book that is needed, but though this specimen has many useful points as a cram book it cannot be wholly recommended. The sense of proportion is poor. The treatment of the prophets is not only inadequate but is marked by several careless mistakes. The consistent minimizing of the supernatural results in such statements as "At Mt. Sinai a religious covenant was enacted on the initiative of Moses," and the "last scene" in the life of Elijah was his encounter with the messengers of Ahaziah. Owing possibly to limits of space the book is full of dogmatic statements equally open to question.

The Gospel According to St. Mark. By C. E. Robinson. Methuen. 5s. This is a well-arranged textbook, opening with an adequate, historical, and literary introduction and a cautious note on miracles. The text is accompanied by a running commentary and notes, sometimes suggestive, sometimes missing the point. The conclusions are generally "orthodox," but readers might be annoyed by the occasional tone of superiority. There is no bibliography, and no authorities are quoted. It is twice said that the "brethren" "were in all probability His true brothers."

M. D. R. W.

Anglican Low Mass. By E. C. Trenholme, S.S.J.E. Faith Press. 1s. 6d. Many English clergy feel that, in view of the break in liturgical tradition caused by the Commonwealth and eighteenth-century lethargy, modesty urges them to learn the details of worship from the greater body which has never lost the tradition. Accordingly, to a less or greater extent, they adopt Roman methods in saying Mass in so far as they are compatible with the Prayer Book. Fr. Trenholme's little handbook is exactly what such priests require. They need not follow all the directions, but at least they can learn what may be done along these lines. Occasionally there are controversial things in which the reader would like reasoned justification instead of assertion, but more cannot be expected in so short a book.

Christ's Message To Us Today. By Pat McCormick. Longmans. 2s. These addresses, broadcast from St. Martin-in-the-Fields, are excellent examples to the clergy of how to fit the Christian message to the needs of those who know but little about it.

Reaction and Progress in Religion. By W. L. Paige Cox. Heffer. 5s. The Archdeacon of Chester holds that Anglo-Catholicism is reaction.

Other views, apparently moderate and Low Church ones, are progressive. Towards what, we wonder? "Progress in Religion" is a quite extraordinarily difficult thing to define. The Archdeacon is most anxious to be fair and claims to be a disciple of Hooker. But when he says that few or no Anglo-Catholics "are at pains to make their sacramental teaching or practice square with . . . the Prayer Book," he is obviously unaware of the multitude of Catholic manuals which are simply based on the Prayer Book. They are, in his opinion, mistaken, but they are absolutely sincere.

The Bible in Scotland. By Sir Andrew Macphail. John Murray. 3s. 6d. Intended as a protest against the new Scottish Syllabus of Religious Instruction which treats the Bible as a book isolated from the Church and worship, and ignores much of modern research. The quality of the criticism may be judged from such statements as these: "To Paul, the earthly life was of little importance." Of Christian baptism "Jesus knew nothing, and Paul cared little." "The evangelists continually confuse Nazarites with Nazarenes." Mark was a Gentile; indeed, all the accounts of the Passion "are the product of heathen minds." Jesus perished as Karabas, the King of the Carnival. The Immaculate Conception is confused with the Virgin Birth. Altogether a book one is surprised to find appearing with the imprint of a famous publisher.

An Ancient Diocese and Modern Problems. By the Bishop of Winchester. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d. *Visitation Charge of the Bishop of Oxford.* Oxford University Press. 1s. Two charges by Bishops of important English sees may be grouped as representing the post-Lambeth 1930 outlook. Both are concerned at the decay of public worship in their dioceses. The Winchester Charge is full of helpful suggestions for making parish life a reality. The Oxford one deals with Reservation, but devotes most of its space to problems connected with the Gospel message.

W. K. L. C.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS LTD., GUILDFORD